

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, and October (double number); the REVIEW in February, May, July, September, November, and December.

PERIODICAL ROOM  
GENERAL LIBRARY  
UNIV. OF MICH.

# The Classical Review

EDITORS { E. HARRISON, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.  
C. M. BOWRA, M.A., Wadham College, Oxford.

All correspondence should be addressed to Mr. BOWRA. Books for review should be sent to the Publisher.

## Board of Management:

Prof. D. S. ROBERTSON, M.A. (Chairman), representing the Cambridge Philological Society.

J. G. BARRINGTON-WARD, M.A.

Prof. J. F. DOBSON, M.A.

Prof. H. A. ORMEBOD, M.A.

F. H. SANDRAH, M.A.

Prof. H. WILLIAMSON, M.A. (Hon. Treasurer).

Representing the Council of the Classical Association.

E. A. BARBER, M.A. (Hon. Secretary), representing the Oxford Philological Society.

With the co-operation of Prof. E. E. Rieu, Harvard University, and Prof. W. J. WOODHOUSE, University of Sydney.

Vol. XLIX

FEBRUARY, 1935

No. I

## CONTENTS

	PAGE		PAGE
NOTES AND NEWS .. .. .	I	REVIEWS (continued):	
KING BEES AND QUEEN BEES, T. HUDSON-WILLIAMS .. .. .	2	(Welles), W. W. TARN, 23; <i>Charun, démon étrusque de la mort</i> (de Ruyt), H. J. ROSE, 24; <i>Rom und die griechische Welt im 4. Jahrhundert</i> (Hoffmann), G. T. GRIFFITH, 25; <i>A Survey of Classical Roman Literature</i> , I. (Lockwood), J. WIGHT DUFF, 25; <i>Untersuchungen zur altlateinischen Dichtersprache</i> (Haffter), C. J. FORDYCE, 26; <i>Exits and Entrances in Roman Comedy</i> (Johnston), W. BEARE, 27; <i>A Study of the Scipionic Circle</i> (Brown), J. WIGHT DUFF, 28; <i>Antikes Führertum</i> (Pohlenz), J. WIGHT DUFF, 28; <i>Ein frühmittelsteisches System der Ethik bei Cicero</i> (Schäfer), H. RACKHAM, 29; <i>Sallust als Historiker</i> (Schür), M. CARY, 30; <i>Horati Carmina Viginti</i> (Campbell), T. E. WRIGHT, 31; <i>Taciti libri ab excessu divi Augusti I-VI</i> (Koestermann), E. C. MARCHANT, 32; <i>Les procédés de la peinture des caractères et la vérité historique dans les biographies de Plutarque</i> (Barbu), M. CARY, 32; <i>Alt-Germanien</i> (Norden), H. J. ROSE, 33; <i>The development of the art of language as exhibited in Latin and in English</i> (Russell), L. R. PALMER, 34; <i>Dictionnaire Illustré Latin-Français</i> (Gaffiot), J. F. LOCKWOOD, 35; <i>Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi VIII; Erasmus: Lectures and Way-faring Sketches</i> (Allen), G. C. RICHARDS, 36 14-36	
PINDAR AND SIMONIDES: FRAGMENTS OF AN ANCIENT COMMENTARY. G. ZUNTZ .. .. .	4	SHORT REVIEWS .. .. .	37
AESCHYLUS, <i>Eumenides</i> , 674-680. R. P. WINNINGTON-INGRAM .. .. .	7	CORRESPONDENCE .. .. .	45
NOTES ON LEWIS AND SHORT. II. R. L. DUNBABIN .. .. .	9	SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS .. .. .	45
GREEK PARTICLES. J. D. DENNISTON and W. L. LORIMER .. .. .	12	BOOKS RECEIVED .. .. .	47
A NEW FRAGMENT OF <i>Medea</i> . H. J. M. MILNE	14		
REVIEWS:			
Concerning <i>Parallels</i> (Rose); <i>The Origin of Attic Comedy</i> (Cornford), W. M. CALDER, 14; <i>A History of Classical Greek Literature</i> (Sinclair), H. J. ROSE, 15; <i>The Humanistic Value of Archaeology</i> (Carpenter), A. SHEWAN, 16; <i>Les conceptions de l'enthousiasme chez les philosophes présocratiques</i> (Delatte), W. HAMILTON, 17; <i>Bacchylidis Carmina cum fragmentis</i> (Snell), H. D. F. KITTO, 17; <i>The Parmenides of Plato</i> (Taylor), G. C. FIELD, 18; <i>Staatsgebiet und Staatsangehörige in Athen</i> (Kahrstedt), A. W. GOMME, 19; <i>Aristotle's Conception of the Soul</i> (Spicer), D. J. ALLAN, 21; <i>La politique étrangère d'Athènes de 404 à 338 avant J.-C.</i> (Cloché), A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE, 21; <i>Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum II.</i> (Robinson), G. MACDONALD, 22; <i>Studien zur Geschichte des antiken Seewesens</i> (Köster), W. W. TARN, 22; <i>Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period</i>			

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

NEW YORK: G. E. STECHERT & CO., 31-33, EAST 10TH STREET.

Price of the present number, 2s. net. Yearly subscription, 12s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$3. Combined yearly subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 25s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$6.25.

## THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on a payment of 2s. 6d., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices (*Review* 10s., *Quarterly* 13s.; combined subscription £1 1s.), though the reduction cannot be guaranteed unless the subscription is paid before January 31st in each year. *Greece and Rome* may be obtained for an annual subscription of 7s. 6d.

Applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr. F. C. G. Langford, c/o The Triangle Offices. Inquiries should be sent to The Triangle Offices, 61, South Molton Street, W. 1, addressed either to the Hon. Secretaries of the Association (Mr. R. M. Rattenbury and Professor T. B. L. Webster) or to the Hon. Secretary of any one of the District Branches—viz., Aberystwyth, Bedfordshire, Birmingham, Bristol, Cambridge, East Anglia, Cardiff, Hull, Kent, Leeds, Leicester, Liverpool, London, Manchester, Northumberland and Durham, North Wales, Nottingham, Oxford, Reading, Sheffield, Southampton, South-Western, Sussex, Swansea, Taunton and West Somerset.

## The Loeb Classical Library

EDITED BY

T. E. PAGE, C.H., LITT.D.

E. CAPPS, PH.D., LL.D.

W. H. D. ROUSE, LITT.D.

*Each volume, Foolscap 8vo, 400–700 pages. Clear type. Cloth, 10s. net. Leather, 12s. 6d. net.*

A series of Greek and Latin Texts, with English Translations on the opposite page. The series is to contain all that is best in Greek and Latin Literature, from the time of Homer to the end of the Western Empire.

'We shall never be independent of our Loeb.'—TIMES LIT. SUPP.

### List of Books published, 1934

#### Latin

- 277. } *Silius Italicus*. Translated by J. D. DUFF. In two volumes.
- 278. }
- 280. *Vitruvius. ON ARCHITECTURE*. Translated by F. GRANGER. In two volumes.—Vol. II.
- 283. *Cato and Varro, de Re Rustica*. Translated by W. D. HOOPER and H. B. ASH.
- 284. *Minor Latin Poets*. Translated by J. WIGHT DUFF and ARNOLD M. DUFF.
- 286. *Valerius Flaccus*. Translated by J. H. MOZLEY.

#### Greek

- 275. *Philo*. Translated by F. H. COLSON and the late G. H. WHITAKER. In nine volumes. Vol. V.
- 255. *Aristotle. PHYSICS*. Translated by PHILIP WICKSTEED and F. M. CORNFORD. Two volumes. Vol. II.
- 270. *S. Basil. THE LETTERS*. Translated by ROY DEFERRARI. Four volumes. Vol. IV.
- 281. *Josephus*. Translated by H. ST. J. THACKERAY and RALPH MARCUS. Eight volumes. Vol. V.
- 276. *Plato. REPUBLIC*. Translated by PAUL SHOREY. Two volumes. Vol. II.
- 282. *Select Papyri*. Translated by A. S. HUNT and C. C. EDGAR. Four volumes. Vol. II.

*Machines or Mind?* (an introduction to the Loeb Classical Library).

*Free together with Descriptive Prospectus, &c.*

WILLIAM HEINEMANN, Windmill Press, Kingswood, Tadworth, Surrey  
HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.



By F  
chron  
XLV  
Horo  
alread  
long  
Bulle  
scribe  
would  
with  
Switz  
'Of d  
many  
have  
annot  
ultim

Th  
to us  
maga  
pages  
Horo  
*Bibli*  
and F  
éche  
d'Hon  
décou  
progr  
which  
*poetic*  
situat  
rat de

From  
'W  
Fowl  
profes  
the c  
*Fach*  
he an  
emba  
could  
one c  
profes  
India  
Fowl  
Fowl  
publi  
as the  
nume

NO.



# The Classical Review

FEBRUARY, 1985

## NOTES AND NEWS

By Parnassian or even by Augustan chronology (see C.R. XLIV. 113, XLVI. 2) the *bis millesimus natus* of Horace falls in this year. America has already taken the matter up, and as long ago as last April the Service Bulletin of the University of Iowa described what bimillenary celebrations would be held in the United States, with a note of the intentions of France, Switzerland, Belgium and Hungary. 'Of course Italy, England, and Germany will participate, but their plans have not yet advanced far enough to be announced.' Let not Britanni be ultimi in this race!

The first published 'homage' to come to us is from Belgium. The quarterly magazine *Les Etudes classiques* gives 154 pages of its first number for the year to Horatian essays: *Le caractère d'Horace*; *Bibliotheca Horatiana* (a list of editions and French translations); *Le triomphal échec*; *La 'couleur de vie' dans l'oeuvre d'Horace*; *Horace et la poésie*; *La découverte de la villa d'Horace*; *Trois programmes de vie civique* (one of which is *aurea mediocritas*); *Ludus poeticus* (in Flemish); *Horace et la situation économique de son temps*; *Le rat de ville et le rat des champs*.

From a correspondent:

'Walking in Broad Street, Oxford, Fowler once happened upon a German professor of his acquaintance, who in the conversation asked him what his *Fach* was. After an embarrassing pause he answered, "Virgil." It would have embarrassed that shy scholar even more could he have known that he would one day be the *Fach* of an American professor. Professor R. H. Coon of Indiana University, a pupil of Warde Fowler's, has weighed every word that Fowler wrote—in books, articles, unpublished papers, diaries, and, so far as they could be recovered, letters to numerous correspondents. His bio-

graphy of 366 pages (appropriately published by Basil Blackwell) occasionally labours under the weight of documentation, but it presents a faithful picture of a many-sided man, who left a characteristic imprint on the classical scholarship of his generation. Well might he hesitate before he answered the German professor—Lincoln undergraduates, Birds, Mozart, the *Ilódis*, Roman History and Religion, Virgil, all profited by his work. He had listened with sympathy to both Mark Pattison and Jowett, and blended their conflicting gospels into one, neglecting neither Learning nor Life.'

M. Norsa and G. Vitelli, who continue to earn both thanks and admiration for the promptitude with which they are issuing important papyri from Italian excavations, have lately published three more in a journal little consulted by English scholars—*Annali della R. Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa*. The first is some thirty lines, half of them more or less complete, of a comedy, possibly the *Θεοφορουμένη* of Menander. The second contains nearly a hundred lines from the *Θράξ* and the *Ἰππομέδων* of Euphorion. This is unfortunately much mutilated, and in the twenty lines which are nearly complete the drift is extremely obscure. Even so, however, it is an important addition to the remains of Euphorion. The third piece, though of less importance, is more surprising than the others. It is a fragment of a debate between Eteocles and Polynices, in the presence of Jocasta, written in somewhat licentious tragic trimeters and resembling in outline Eur. *Phoen.* 446 ff., though with little verbal contact and on a briefer scale. As the editors say, these verses were not worth copying, and therefore may be autograph; yet they seem to have one error at least which is not mere 'itacism,' for in the third line *ερω* should

perhaps be ἴτω (the French 'va!') rather than the editors' αἰτῶ. In the first line of all read οὐκ ἀντερῶν σοι.

*The Year's Work* for 1934 has the chapters which were announced in the C.R. for December (p. 205). Mr. T. W. Allen opens his review of Greek palaeography for the year with an obituary notice of the Palaeographical Society, *optime de studiis nostris merita*. He tells why the Society was wound up, and ends with suggestions: 'It would seem that in the future great libraries should publish their own facsimiles (as has been done at Paris and Florence) and that the individual philologist when he edits an author should include a full-size facsimile, folded or even cut if necessary, of the principal MS. or MSS. containing it.'

From a correspondent:

'On January 3 members of the Classical Association were welcomed by the Modern Languages Association as partakers in a discussion on 'The Relative Value and Position of Classical and Modern Languages in a Liberal Education.' The openers for the Classical Association were Professor Lascelles Abercrombie and Professor T. B. L. Webster, who were followed on behalf of the Modern Languages Association by Mr. W. Ripman and Professor R. L. Graeme Ritchie respectively. Among the subsequent

speakers for the Classics were Mr. R. H. Barrow and Dr. Mackail. While nothing of striking originality emerged from the discussion, it was interesting and profitable to have a re-statement of the aims and results of education on these two lines. The writer was unable to stay till the end of the discussion, but he hopes that it will not be discourteous to his hosts to say that in his opinion, whatever the merits of their case, the Classical exponents had very much the better of the argument—an impression which is confirmed by the report which appeared in *The Times* of January 4.'

The Warburg Institute, with its famous library of books on humanism and the revival of learning, is now established at 3 Thames House, Millbank, London, S.W. 1 (see C.R. XLVIII. 118). Interesting series of lectures for 1935 have been arranged, and students of the classics will be pleased to know that Mr. R. P. Hinks will lecture on 'Allegorical Representations in Ancient Art' on May 22, 29, and June 3, and Dr. R. Klibansky on 'Platonism in the Middle Ages and Renaissance' on June 12, 19, and 26. Lectures will be from 5 to 7 p.m. There is no fee for admission, but those wishing to attend are asked to apply to the Secretary, stating in which courses they wish to take part.

### KING BEES AND QUEEN BEES.

Prima noui ducent examina reges.  
VIRG. G. IV. 21.  
Amisso dubiae rege uagantur apes.  
Ov. F. III, 556.

MOST of our text-books tell us, directly or by implication, that the ancients were unaware that what we call the queen bee was a female. Although there are hints to the contrary scattered here and there in dictionaries and commentaries on Greek and Latin authors, I have never seen the material collected and estimated as a whole. Readers of the C.R. may like to have some of the

evidence for both sides put together in a short compass.

I. *King bee*. The terms used by the ancients for the ruling bee are βασιλεύς, ἡγεμών, ἑσθήν, rex, ductor, dux, imperator. Examples: οἱ βασιλεῖς καὶ ἡγεμόνες ἔχουσι μὲν κέντρον, ἀλλ' οὐ τύπτουσι, *Ar. Hist. An.* V, 2 = 553b. ὥσπερ ἐν σμήνῃσιν ἡγεμόνας τε καὶ βασιλέας, *Plat. Rep.* 520a. αὐτὸς ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ ὁ ἄρχων, *Ael. Nat. An.* V, 11 (ed. Hercher). Xenophon has ὁ ἡγεμών, *Oec.* VII, 39; but see *infra* II. ἑσθήν: ὁ βασιλεὺς κατὰ Ἑφεσίους· ἀπὸ μεταφορᾶς τοῦ

μελὶ  
ἀπὸ  
31 (I  
XI,  
Ca  
Mup  
the  
sugg  
conn  
ther  
pass  
duct  
sine  
(Hae  
appe  
lum  
'Th  
wha  
oon  
T.,  
amp  
natu  
their  
IA 3  
Dict  
Re  
etc.:  
histo  
mine  
a few  
gene  
Antio  
croy  
par u  
mâle  
gr. e  
apum  
ner c  
error  
queen  
Conin  
ancie  
male,  
"kin  
rately  
fact  
the c  
know  
Sarge  
p. 10  
raises  
till th  
ancie  
suppo  
howev  
τῷ σ  
other

μελισσῶν βασιλέως, δὲ εἴρηται ἐσθὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔσω ἐνέξεσθαι, *Et. Mag.* 383, 31 (p. 1100 in Gaisford's ed.). *Ox. Pap.* XI, 1362 (= Callim. *Aet.* II, 23 in Cahen's 'Budé' ed. of C., 1922) has *Μυρμιδόνων ἐσθῆνα* . . . Πηλέα where the aspirate as Liddell and Scott (1929) suggest, is 'perh. because of supposed connexion with ἐσμός, ἔσσαι or ἡσσάω'; there is no reference to bees in the passage. For *reges* cf. *Virg. G. IV*, 21; *ductores* ib. 88. Cf. *apes* . . . *rex ipse sine aculeo est*, *Sen. Clem. I*, 19, 2 (Haase p. 293). *Qui rex in quoque appellatur examine* . . . *hunc esse solum marem*, *Plin. H.N. XI*, 46. Cf. 'Thise flies that men clepeth bees, whan they maken hir king, they chesoon that hath no prikke,' Chaucer, *Pers. T.*, 468 (394). The first English example of *queen* seems to be: 'of the nature and properties of Bees, and of their Queene,' C. Butler, *Fem. Mon.* 1A 3 (1609 A.D.) quoted in the Oxford Dictionary.

Remarks of modern commentators etc.: 'Our superior knowledge of natural history has however enabled us to determine that the chief of the hive is always a female, not a male (*rex*) as was the general belief,' Smith's *Dict. Gk. Rom. Antiquities*, 1890 (s.v. *agricultura*). 'On croyait que la ruche était gouvernée par un roi (*ἡγεμών*), c'est à dire par un mâle,' Daremberg-Saglio's *Dict. Ant. gr. et rom.* I s.v. *apes*. *Reges*, quos nunc apum matres esse scimus, Heyne-Wagner on *Virg. G. IV*, 68 (1830). 'The error of the ancients in supposing the queen bee to be a king is well known,' Conington on *Virg. G. IV*, 68. 'The ancients regarded the queen bee as the male,' Page on *Virg. G. IV*, 21. 'The "kings" are what we call more accurately "queens,"' Sidgwick on *id.* 'The fact that one queen is the mother of the colony (*die Mutterbiene*) was not known till the seventeenth century,' Sargeant and Royds on *Virg. G. IV*, p. 106 (1904). 'The "reges" of line 21 raises a question which was not settled till the sixteenth century. Among the ancients the queen-bee was universally supposed to be a male. Xenophon, however, in one passage speaks of ἡ ἐν τῷ σμήνει ἡγεμὼν μέλιττα [but see the other examples in II]. Writers of the

sixteenth and seventeenth centuries describe her variously as a king or queen, but only in the sense of ruler of the hive. . . . The sex was discovered by Swammerdam, the great Dutch naturalist (1637-1680): T. F. Royds, *The Beasts, Birds and Bees of Virgil*, p. 60 (3rd ed. 1930). 'Diese (sc. *βασιλεὺς, rex* etc.) haben sonst männliches Geschlecht, nur Xenophon sagt ἡ ἡγεμὼν,' Pauly-Wissowa III, p. 433 (1899); there is nothing about it in the supplementary article of 1924, *Suppl. IV*, p. 211. But see the examples in II.

II. *Queen bee*. A. ἡ ἐν τῷ σμήνει ἡγεμὼν μέλιττα, *Xen. Oec. VII*, 17. ἡ τῶν μελιττῶν ἡγεμὼν, *ib.* 32 (twice). τῆς ἐν τῷ σμήνει ἡγεμόνος, *ib.* 38; but τὰ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος ἔργα, *ib.* 39. But ἡ ἡγεμὼν may=ἡ ἡγουμένη μέλιττα, so that the evidence for a queen is not conclusive. 'The ancients from Aristotle downward commonly mistook the queen-bee for a king; but curiously enough the soldier Xenophon knew what escaped the naturalist Aristotle and the book-learned Pliny, that the head of the hive is a female': Sir James Frazer on *Ov. Fast. III*, 555-6.

'The Greeks regarded the queen-bee and queen-wasp as masculine, and Xenophon himself uses ὁ ἡγεμὼν in *Cyr. V*, 1, 24, and *Hell. III*, 2, 28. . . . But here and elsewhere in this chapter the comparison between the queen-bee and the woman in the house is being emphasised': Sewell on *Xen. Oec. VII*, 17 (1925). Cf. 'The word chosen [in the 16th and 17th cent.] depended largely, according to Tickner Edwardes, on the sex of the reigning sovereign of the country': Royds *l.c.* p. 60.

B. καὶ λέγει Μεγασθένης, θηρέεσθαι αὐτοῦ [sc. τοῦ μαργαρίτου] τὴν κόγχην δικτύοις, νέμεσθαι δ' ἐν τῇ θαλάσῃ κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ πολλὰς κόγχας, κατὰπερ τὰς μελισσας. καὶ εἶναι γὰρ καὶ τοῖσι μαργαρίτησι βασιλέα ἢ βασιλισσαν, ὡς τῇσι μελίσσησι, *Arrian, Ind. VIII*, 11 (p. 34 ed. Chantraine, 1927). It was this passage that led to the present enquiry. It is just possible that Arrian (c. 150 A.D.) or Megasthenes (c. 300 B.C.) did not intend ἢ βασιλισσαν to refer to the bees; he may have meant: 'the shellfish have a king or queen, as the bees have a royal head.' If anyone chooses

to regard ἡ βασιλίσσαν as an interpolation, our passage will then carry us no further back than the end of the 12th century A.D., the date of A (= *Vind. hist.* 4), our earliest MS; but the text has the support of another passage in Arrian's works.

C. τίς γὰρ εἶ; ὁ ταῦρος εἶ ἢ ἡ βασίλισσα τῶν μελισσῶν; δείξόν μοι τὰ σύμβολα τῆς ἡγεμονίας, οἷα ἐκείνη ἐκ φύσεως ἔχει: Arr. *Epict. Diss.* III, 22, 99 (p. 279 ed. Schenkl, 1894). So Arrian or Epictetus (c. 50-120 A.D.) called the ruling bee βασίλισσα; the use of the word in the above context is remarkable, as the usual βασιλεύς with its suggestion of a τύραννος with unlimited power would be more effective in driving the philosopher's point home.

D. τῶν δ' ἡγεμόνων . . . καὶ καλοῦνται

ὑπὸ τινων μητέρες ὡς γεννῶντες. Arr. *Hist. An.* V, 21=553a, μητέρες, 'of queen bees' L. and S. (1932). The Oxford translation has: 'These rulers are called by some "the mothers" from an idea that they bear or generate the bees.' Although these examples are to be found s.v. in dictionaries, I have not seen any use made of them in discussing the 'king bee.' The procreation of bees was certainly a mystery to the ancients; but the above quotations are at any rate enough to prove that the head bee was occasionally called by names usually reserved for females; it would be rash to claim that the Greeks could give proof of her sex; but they had some inkling of the truth.

T. HUDSON-WILLIAMS.

Bangor.

## PINDAR AND SIMONIDES.

### FRAGMENTS OF AN ANCIENT COMMENTARY.

PAP. BEROL. 13875<sup>1</sup> is a fragment of a papyrus-roll, of which only the upper part is preserved; it is of the first half of the second century A.D. Under a vacant space of 3.7 cm. are the final letters of eleven lines of one column, and to the right of this twelve complete lines of another; of the thirteenth line only the tops of the letters remain.

As the reading of the fair large book-hand is certain, even where the papyrus is rubbed or worm-eaten, I give the text with unimportant corrections and supplements. The only difficulty was in the punctuation of the last sentence.

- 1 ποσι· ἐξήρκει ἡ ἑτέρα
- 2 ἀντωνυμία, ἢ ἡ νιν
- 3 ἢ ἡ ἐκείνου<sup>1</sup>. Οὐδὲ πελέ-
- 4 κεισ οὐδὲ Σηρήν· ταῦτα
- 5 πρὸς Σιμωνίδην, ἐπεὶ
- 6 ἐκείνος ἐν ἐνὶ ἄσματι
- 7 ἐπόησεν Σειρήν τὸν
- 8 Πεισιστράτην· ἐν ἄλλοις
- 9 δὲ ἄσμασι καὶ τὸν πελέ-
- 10 κυφ[?]ραν ἵππου ὄνο-

<sup>1</sup> This is not the place to say how much I am indebted to Professor Schubart both for my acquaintance with papyrology and for much else besides. Here I will only thank him for checking my readings of the text. I may add that I am indebted also to Professor Friedländer of Halle and to Professor D. S. Robertson of Cambridge, who very kindly read my manuscript and made some valuable comments.

- 11 μάζε[ι, τ]ὸν χελιδόνα
- 12 ἐπίσημον ἔχοντα· χε-
- 13 λιδόνας γὰρ ἵππους
- 14 [ἐστίζον]

The apostrophe-like signs which mark the end of the lemma after ]πος in l. 1, and of the interpretation after ]κεῖνον in l. 3 are the only original marks of punctuation.<sup>2</sup> There are no accents; and the spacing of the lemmata is due to the editor. A corrector has emended l. 3 <η>η, l. 5 τιμωνιδην, l. 8 π<ε>ι-σιστρατον, l. 11 χελ[ε]ιδονα; but he left unchanged l. 4 πελέκεσ, l. 7 σειρηνας, l. 13/14 χελιδονας.<sup>3</sup> In l. 9/10 πελεκυφοραν was recognized by Schubart.

From the left column only the following remains are preserved: (1) ωσ, (2) βαν, (3) πολι, (4) ονα (or ονα),

<sup>2</sup> After Σηρήν in l. 4 a similar mark seems to have been omitted by the copyist.

<sup>3</sup> According to the principle of *lectio rarior* I do not suppose Σηρήν l. 4 to be a scribal error for Σειρήν (although the latter form occurs in Pap. Ox. 659=Parthenia fig. 104d 33 Schr.); the Alkman papyrus gives Σηρηλιδων (fig. 1. 96D) and σήριον (ib. 62; cf. Herodian II 573L σηρά for σερρά). Hence Crusius changed σειρήν to σηρήν in Alkman fig. 10D. Solmsen (*Beiträge z. griech. Wortforschung* I 1909, p. 129) remarks: 'Σηρηλιδει beweist, dass σειρήν gedehntes e in der Wurzelsilbe hatte.' So we may infer that the Dorian form was usual in choric poetry.

(5) τ  
(9) β  
Cle  
menta  
Pinda  
tation  
ferred

In  
lemma  
the la  
and v  
prono  
αν οι .  
Perha  
betwe  
νιν P.  
ing so  
preser  
τὰς αἰ  
περισσ

The  
Σηρήν  
Simon  
hardly  
also en  
ence  
hand,  
sion in  
that π  
poems  
used in

The  
φόρας  
the ho  
with a  
extant  
with th  
text a  
prising  
of the  
comm  
the χ  
not th  
to be

<sup>1</sup> Cf.  
αὐτῷ (le  
ticipie  
πόμεν  
been as

<sup>2</sup> Ap  
the text  
<sup>3</sup> See  
Phoen.

<sup>4</sup> See  
note; c  
χελιδών  
called,  
interpre  
<sup>5</sup> He



- (5) *τρι*, (6) *χη*, (7) *πων*, (8) *εστιν*,  
(9) *βικα*, (10) *σε*, (11) *λι*.

Clearly it is a fragment of a commentary on an unknown poem by Pindar; to whom else could the annotation *ταῦτα πρὸς Σιμωνίδην* be referred?

In the Pindar-text as in the first lemma of the papyrus, of which only the last syllable remains, stood *κείνον* and *νιν*, the one near the other. The pronoun is similarly doubled in *Ol. I 57* *ἀν οἱ . . . αὐτῷ* and *P. II 7 ἄς . . . κείνας*.<sup>1</sup> Perhaps in our fragment a τε stood between *κείνον* and *νιν*, like *αὐτόν τε νιν* *P. XII 6* and *Ol. VI 14*; the following scholion to the latter passage is preserved: *ὅτι<sup>2</sup> ἐκ παραλλήλου τέθεικε τὰς ἀντωνυμίας, καὶ ἔστιν ἡ μία αὐτῶν περισσῇ*.<sup>3</sup>

The commentator's statement, that *Σηρήν* in Pindar was an allusion to Simonides' use of the same word, would hardly be conceivable had not Pindar also employed the word in some reference to Peisistratos. On the other hand, the indefinite manner of expression in what follows makes it unlikely that *πελεκυφόρας ἵππος* in 'some other poems' of Simonides should have been used in regard to Peisistratos.

The hitherto unknown word *πελεκυφόρας* seems to be formed like *σαμφόρας*; the horse, then, would have been branded with a double axe. The rest of the extant papyrus is apparently concerned with the explanation of this mark. The text as given above may seem surprising; but any other interpretation of the passage is hardly possible. The commentator, having met in literature the *χειδῶν* as a mark for a horse,<sup>4</sup> but not the *πέλεκυς*, presumed these marks to be identical;<sup>5</sup> and with much good

will one might really find some correspondence between the design of a swallow with outstretched wings and that of a double axe.<sup>6</sup>

In the second lemma the double *οὐδέ* is strange: up till now there is no parallel to it in Pindar.<sup>7</sup> Should we wish to preserve it, we should at least have to presume that it was preceded by *οὐ*.<sup>8</sup> But since 'neither axe nor Siren' seems to be a disjunctive expression complete in itself—and rather a curious one—any third member would be out of place. That is why I have rejected the obvious supplement *κείνόν <τέ> νιν [οὐχ' ἵπ]πος οὐδὲ πελέκεις οὐδὲ Σηρήν*, and prefer to suppose that here, as often occurs, *οὐδέ* is a scribal error for *οὔτε*.

I think it not unlikely that the whole text is a fragment of a commentary by *Didymus*. The combination of grammatical comment with interpretation, the circuitous style, and the tendency to digress, are in his manner, and he is generally assumed to be the chief source of our Pindar-scholia. In the scholia which bear his name he mentions Simonides,<sup>9</sup> he remarks occasionally that a word is *παρέλκον*,<sup>10</sup> speaks about the pronoun *νιν*,<sup>11</sup> uses the word *ἐπίσημον*,<sup>12</sup> and not rarely<sup>13</sup> offers rubbish more surprising than the identification in our text of the axe with the swallow.<sup>14</sup>

thesis in the use of *πτέρυγες* or *πτερύγια* for certain parts of the *λόγχη* or *εἶφος*: see Pollux V 21, Hesychius s.v. *πτερύγια* (Professor Friedländer); perhaps also in the double meaning of the Latin *bipennis*.

<sup>6</sup> Professor Zahn of the Berlin Museum was kind enough to show me a convincing explanation of this mark: on Dipylon-vases there are pictures of horses above whose backs great double axes are painted. It seems, then, to be originally a sacred symbol, as in the Cretan cult; cf. the *κηρυκεῖον* and the snake, which are found on vases as marks branded on horses, indicating originally that the horse was consecrated to Hermes or to Hades.

<sup>7</sup> For *I. II 6* is of another kind.

<sup>8</sup> Like Soph. *O. T.* 1378. In Hom. *Od.* XXII 222 the first of three *οὐδέ* takes the place of *οὐ*.

<sup>9</sup> Ad *Ol.* II. 15/29.

<sup>10</sup> Ib. 46/82.

<sup>11</sup> Ad *Nem.* IV 3/5.

<sup>12</sup> Ad *Ol.* X 70/83.

<sup>13</sup> See schol. *Ol.* XIII 20/27, *Ol.* X 70/83.

<sup>14</sup> A reference to the Latin *bipennis* (see above, note 5) would also be natural to a grammarian who lived at Rome and wrote *de latinitate*.

Here is one less weighty argument: from

<sup>1</sup> Cf. also *I. II 14* c. schol.: *Ξενοκράτει . . . αὐτῷ* (less striking, indeed, as there the participle *ὁπάσας* relates to the substantive, and *πῆμπε* to the pronoun). All these places have been assailed by conjectures.

<sup>2</sup> Apparently there was a critical sign in the text.

<sup>3</sup> See also schol. *Ol.* III 67e, schol. Eur. *Phoen.* 497.

<sup>4</sup> See schol. Arist. *Aves* 1293 with White's note; cf. schol. Ar. *Nub.* 23. The idea that *χειδῶν* might mean the part of a horse's hoof so called, or even a horse's name, does not help to interpret the text.

<sup>5</sup> He might have found support for his hypo-



Thus our papyrus may give us two small fragments of Simonides: *Σηρήν*—used in some reference to Peisistratos—and *πελεκυφόρας ἵππος*,<sup>1</sup> and a slightly larger one of Pindar:

κείνον (τέ) νῦν [. . . . .] ποτ  
 . . . οὐτε πελέκεις οὐτε Σηρήν . . .

Any interpretation covering these very fragmentary words is of course only hypothetical.

If we are right in presuming *Σηρήν* to be an allusion to Peisistratos, the poem in question must relate to Athens. It cannot be the great dithyramb, as we know that in it the poet praised the merits of Athens in the Persian War; and we must think of some poem of

the wretched remains of the left column of the papyrus only l. 9 ]βικα seems to be of some significance. I see four possible supplements: *Ἀραβικά, βέρβικα, ἄμβικα, κίμβικα*. The first two may be disregarded. *Ἀμβικες* in Athenaeus XI 480d are said to be *Ἀργεῖαι κῶλικες*, something like which might have been written by Pindar. Now the 'cup lexicon' in Athenaeus is almost certainly derived from Pamphilus (cf. L. Cohn, *Jahrb. f. klass. Phil.* Suppl. 12, 1881, 324 and Rudolf, *Leips. Stud.* 7, 1884, 125); and frequent citations of Didymus by name make it very probable that Pamphilus here borrowed from Didymus (the *Σύμμικτα ἢ Συμποσιακά*, I suppose), all the more so as the explanation of *λεπαστή* Athen. 485a (finally derived from Aristophanes Byz. fg. 77 N.) occurs also in Hesychius s.v. and schol. Arist. *Pax* 916, and that of *κυμβιον* Athen. XI 477 f. in Hesychius and Harpocration. *Ἀμβίς* is found only in this passage of Athenaeus; if it appeared in our papyrus, it must have been Didymus who was quoting here from one of his lexica, as he did so often.—Finally *κίμβικα*: Xenophanes in the *Σόλλοι* used this word of Simonides (see schol. Aristoph. *Pax* 656, Wilamowitz, *Sitzb. Ber. Berl. Ak.* 1901, 1303). In the very learned scholion to Aristophanes—Didymean, I suppose—the fact is mentioned as evidence for Simonides' *φιλαργυρία*, which was attacked by Pindar in *I.* II and elsewhere and therefore is often commented on in our scholia to Pindar. As the author of our papyrus commentary was interested in Pindar's relations with Simonides, I hold the supplement *κίμβικα* to be the most likely, and its author to be sought in the common source of the extant Pindar scholia, the Aristophanes scholion, and Athenaeus, namely Didymus, who himself derived this information from Chamaeleon *περὶ Σιμωνίδου* (see Athenaeus 656c, d and 456c.)

I am well aware that this is a highly uncertain calculation; I have only written it down to spare someone else the same trouble.

<sup>1</sup> *ἵππος* of course may be an addition of the commentator.

Pindar's earlier period, before his relations with Athens were cut off by the rise to power of the extreme democracy.

*Σηρήν*, I suggest, can only allude to the seductive eloquence of the tyrant;<sup>2</sup> *πελέκεις* then, as opposed to it, should denote the axes of his bodyguard<sup>3</sup>—a clearly hostile allusion to the means of the tyrant's power.

'Neither executioners' axes nor seductive eloquence'—what was it that they could not do? Probably this: they could not move, could not terrify some resolute adversary of the tyrant.<sup>4</sup>

The tyrant's adversaries with whom Pindar was concerned are the Alkmeonidae. There can be no question of the Megakles to whom Pindar in 486 dedicated the seventh Pythian Ode, for he was too young to be called an antagonist of Peisistratos. Thus we are left with his father Hippokrates, Kleisthenes' brother, on whose death Pindar composed a threnos, before 486.<sup>5</sup> To that threnos our fragment might belong.<sup>6</sup>

Ironical repetition of a word of Simonides would be quite compatible with that: Simonides lived at the court of Hipparchos: so in one poem he may well have spoken in praise of Peisistratos;<sup>7</sup> and he left Athens when the tyranny fell. The ancient commentators, then, may be quite right in continually seeking evidence of Pindar's

<sup>2</sup> A *δημηγορία* of Peisistratos is mentioned by Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.* 15, 4.

<sup>3</sup> As a variation of the prosaic *δορυφόροι*?—*πέλεκυς* = executioner's axe: fg. trag. adesp. 412 N.

<sup>4</sup> *κείνον τέ νῦν* might refer to this opponent; or the object might be supplied: *τόν, οὐτε πελέκεις* . . . ; as we do not know whether in P's text our second lemma followed the first immediately.

<sup>5</sup> See schol. *Pyth.* VII 17 = fg. 137b Schr.; cf. Wilamowitz *Pindaros* 155.

<sup>6</sup> Notwithstanding that hitherto we have not known of a Didymus-commentary on the threnoi. If this ascription is correct, the view of Boeckh and Wilamowitz, that fg. 137a Schr. belongs to this threnos, must be rejected on metrical grounds; while fg. inc. 141 Schr., which is in metrical correspondence with our fragment, might be claimed for it (cf. P. Maas *Griech. Metrik* § 56, 3 on the 'rhythmus Anaxiphorminges').

<sup>7</sup> Simonides a praiser of tyrants: see Plato *Protag.* 346b 5.

animosity against him. That may have been a consequence of political antagonism: the hostility of the continental follower of the aristocrats to the Ionian

friend of the tyrants, and of the democrats afterwards.

GÜNTHER ZUNTZ.

Repton School.

### AESCHYLUS. *EUMENIDES*, 674-680.

- 675 AΘ. "Ἦδη κελεύω τοῦσδ' ἀπὸ γνώμης φέρειν  
ψῆφον δίκαιαν, ὥς ἅλις λελεγμένῳ;  
XO. "Ἡμῖν μὲν ἦδη πᾶν τετόξευται βέλος·  
μὲν δ' ἀκούσαι πῶς ἄγων κριθήσεται.  
AΘ. Τί γάρ; πρὸς ὑμῶν πῶς τίθεισ' αἰμοφθοῖς;  
XO. "Ἡκούσας ὧν ἡκούσας, ἐν δὲ καρδίᾳ  
680 ψῆφον φέροντες ὅρκον αἰδέσθε, ξένοι.

So the parts are distributed in the MSS. But clearly either 676-77 or 679-80 belong to Apollo. Karsten gave him the latter couplet, and the majority of recent editors has followed him.<sup>1</sup> Weil in 1861 did likewise, but transposed the couplets. In his Teubner text however (1907) he reverted to the traditional order of lines and attributed 676-77 to Apollo. This attribution seems to have all the internal evidence in its favour. The following points are not all equally cogent, but their cumulative weight is considerable.

(i) Apollo has been presenting 'the case for the defence' and has just finished the last of several speeches of fair length. It is more natural that he, in answer to Athena's question, should state that he has finished his case, that she should then turn to his opponents and ask if they have anything further to say.

(ii) The plural is used of both sides: ἡμῖν 676, ὑμῶν 678. But in the former couplet there is a change from plural to singular in the second line. If it is given to the Furies, this change has no motive except metrical convenience. Further, it is harsh, if not impossibly harsh, to make their leader speak in one line for the whole Chorus, in the next in her own person, particularly in view of the fact that she has done the talking, while they are all doing the waiting! But Apollo can quite naturally speak in the first line as advocate for Orestes, then announce his personal intention of waiting to see how the verdict goes. Which in fact he does, and presumably leaves the stage soon

after it is given, though there is no certain indication when.<sup>2</sup>

(iii) The metaphor in πᾶν τετόξευται βέλος is appropriate to Apollo. When he appeared to the Furies in his temple, he was armed with the bow (181 ff.). Then he threatened them with actual arrows; now it is a natural figure with which to describe his arguments.<sup>3</sup>

(iv) No doubt the reason why Karsten's attribution was made and accepted is that the solemn appeal to the jurors to respect their oath seemed more appropriate in the mouth of the Delphic god than in that of a Fury. I do not wish to discuss here the part played by Apollo in this play and in the trilogy as a whole, which I take to have been not altogether creditable.<sup>4</sup> But an earlier reference that he has made to the juror's oath must be taken into consideration. Lines 619-21 are difficult, but can hardly bear any meaning other than the following. He has answered Orestes' question (εἰ δίκαιός εἴτε μὴ: 612-13) with a resonant δίκαιός, and has claimed to speak with the authority of Zeus. He continues: 'Consider how great is the force of this claim to justice (τὸ δίκαιον τοῦτο); I bid you follow the will of my father.' By μὲν and δὲ this is given the form of an antithesis between τὸ δίκαιον and βουλή πατρός. No doubt the distinction implied is to the confident Apollo purely formal and rhetorical. But the following line still postulates it. He gives as

<sup>2</sup> Orestes has already said (243): ἀμυνῶ τέλος δίκης. And once he has been besieged by the Furies he cannot but wait in any case.

That the Chorus make use of a similar expression at 732 does not affect the argument either way.

<sup>3</sup> The arrows of Apollo occur elsewhere in the trilogy, e.g. *Agamemnon* 510. At *Choephoroi* 1033 the metaphor (τόξω κτλ.) is suggested by the mention of Apollo. At *Eumenides* 628 we find that the archer god can sympathize with the far-darting Amazons, but not with the crafty murderess Clytemnestra.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *C.R.* XLVII, pp. 97-104.

<sup>1</sup> E.g. Campbell, Headlam, Mazon, Sidgwick, Verrall, Wecklein, Wilamowitz.

a reason why they should follow the will of Zeus that Zeus is stronger than an oath. What other oath can this be than their juror's oath, which was, as we learn from 674-75, ἀπὸ γνώμης φέρειν ψῆφον δικάζαν—to decide the case on its merits according to the best of their judgment?<sup>1</sup> In effect, they must do as they are told, should a paradoxical conflict arise between τὸ δίκαιον and Apollo's interpretation of the will of Zeus. It is an attempt to browbeat with which we can compare 713-14. Now for Aeschylus such a conflict is at least conceivable (there could hardly otherwise have been a divided verdict); and I believe that in the τῇ σῇ φρενὶ of 612 he has put us on our guard against the subjectivity of Apollo's coming pronouncement.<sup>2</sup> However this may be, Apollo has, in form at any rate, incited them to perjury, in what is perhaps a threat, as 667 ff. is a bribe. Now to make him say in our passage ὅρκον αἰδεῖσθε might after this be an intended effect of irony. But it is surely easier to ascribe this couplet to the Furies, who have already displayed their interest in oaths and the weight which they put upon them. I refer to 429 ff., where they wish to make the issue depend on a contest of oaths between themselves and Orestes upon the simple question of fact, and are rebuked by Athena for this undue simplification. Further, it is appropriate for the Furies to reinforce Athena's words and remind the jury that they must return a just verdict according to their consciences, uninfluenced by the bolts of cajolery, threatening and (as I believe) sophistry that have come from Apollo's bow.

(v) 678 might well be addressed by Athena to Apollo and Orestes, though it is perhaps doubtful whether a goddess would so lump together a fellow-deity and a mortal. To both sides she is

polite, for she desires the favour of both Apollo and the Eumenides for her beloved citizens. Indeed the idea in ἄμομφος is one of the leading notions of this play, which is to end to the satisfaction of all parties. It is the wish of Athena that offence shall be neither given nor taken by any. Thus ἄμομφος here of Orestes would be complementary to the point of the same adjective at 475: there she says that she regards the city as having no claim to resentment against him, here she would be anxious that he should have no fault to find with Athens. But it is no less appropriate to the Furies. Taking it together with the occurrence of the word in her first address to them (413), we find the same suggestion of reciprocity. There she was on the point of referring disparagingly to their outward appearance, but checked herself on the grounds that they had done her no offence. So here she wishes to avoid giving offence to them—by cutting short the presentation of their case. On either interpretation it is not surprising to find a cognate word occurring towards the end of the play, when the Furies, now the Σεμναί, sing that the inhabitants of Athens will find nothing to complain of in their lot under the new régime, protected alike by Pallas and by themselves (1019: οὐτι μέμψασθε συμφορὰς βίον<sup>3</sup>).

If the Medicean manuscript had given 679-80 to Apollo, the strength of these considerations might well have justified us in altering the attributions of these two couplets. As it is, the tradition is neutral; and against a number of reasons for giving 676-77 to Apollo and leaving the Furies with 679-80 there appears not to be one for the course taken by the great majority of editors.

R. P. WINNINGTON-INGRAM.

Birkbeck College, London.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Mazon, *Eschyle* II, 151 n. The Athenian dicast swore in cases for which the laws did not provide to give his verdict γνώμη τῇ δικαστῇ (Demosthenes, XXXIX 40). Aeschylus probably had the terms of this oath in mind.

<sup>2</sup> The tone of τοὺς ἐμούς τε καὶ Διὸς (713) is a similar warning signal.

<sup>3</sup> The οὐ μέμφομαι of Orestes at 596 hardly belongs to the pattern, but reminds us that the final solution will be satisfactory to him as well as to the Athenians—and the Furies (cf. 836: ἐναυτίους).

merg  
'pitch  
author  
mergac  
pitchfo  
errone  
sheave  
use pi

Var  
three  
cut the  
sickle  
as the  
handf  
them  
them  
they l  
In Pi  
with  
This  
of ear  
straw  
be th  
Near  
cut t  
taking  
straw  
upper  
baske

Pli  
grain  
ing a  
or fo  
burn  
cattle  
reapi  
he sa  
with  
off b  
medi  
duas  
some  
othe  
mille  
(pec

1 I  
r. r.  
Agri  
and  
that  
stripi  
in 1  
whea  
Back

## NOTES ON LEWIS AND SHORT.

(Continued from C.R. XLVIII, 214.)

*mergae* and *merges*. Translated 'pitchfork.' For this they have the authority of Festus, whose account of *mergae* shows that he took them to be pitchforks. But this explanation is erroneous, for the Romans did not make sheaves of grain and therefore did not use pitchforks to handle grain.

Varro, *de r. r.*, 1. 50, says there are three ways of reaping. In Umbria they cut the straw close to the ground with a sickle and lay each handful on the ground as they cut it. Then they go over the handfuls and cut the ears off and throw them into a basket (*corbem*) and send them to the threshing-floor; the straw they leave to be collected into a heap. In Picenum they have a curved stick with a little iron saw at the end of it. This takes hold of a 'bundle' (*fascem*) of ears, cuts them off, and leaves the straw standing to be cut later (this may be the *pecten* of Columella and Pliny). Near Rome and in most places they cut the grain half-way up the stalk, taking hold of it with the left hand; the straw below the hand is cut later; the upper part with the ears is carried in baskets (*corbibus*) to the threshing-floor.

Pliny, *N.H.*, 18 §§ 296-7, says that grain was reaped in various ways according as the straw was wanted for thatch or fodder or not. Millet-straw was burned, barley-straw was saved for cattle. On the large farms of Gaul a reaping-machine was used.<sup>1</sup> Elsewhere, he says, the stalks are cut half-way down with a sickle or the ears are stripped off between two forks (*stipulae alibi mediae falce praeciduntur, atque inter duas mergites spica destringitur*). In some places it is cut at the root, in others pulled up root and all. In Gaul millet is gathered with a hand-comb (*pectine manuali*). Cf. Col., *de r. r.*,

2. 20(21) § 3, *sunt autem metendi genera complura. multi falcibus ueruculatis, atque his uel rostratis uel denticulatis medium culmum secant: multi mergis, alii pectinibus spicam ipsam legunt, idque in rara segete facillimum in densa difficillimum est* (i.e. some cut the stalks in the middle with a sickle, others gather the heads only with *mergae* or *pectines*).

From these passages it is clear that the Romans did not make sheaves, but dropped the ears of corn into baskets (*corbes*, cf. Liv. 2. 5 § 3, 22. 1 § 10) and carried them to the threshing-floor, and further that *mergae* or *mergites* were used for pulling off the ears (see Marx's note on Plautus, *Rudens*, 763). Apparently the ears were caught between a pair of small forks and pulled off. It seems a very slow and clumsy way of harvesting. The heads could be pulled off if the soil were stiff; in loose soil many of the stalks would be pulled up by the roots.

It will be obvious that pitchforks would be useless for making heaps of ears, and that, as only the heads were brought to the threshing-floor, and that in baskets, there were no *manipuli* to handle. So Festus' explanation must be wrong. The word *manipuli* is properly used of hay, and *furcilla* is the Latin for a hayfork, cf. Varro, *de r. r.*, 1. 49 § 1, *herba . . . debet . . . furcillis uersari: cum perauerit, de his manipulos fieri ac uehi ad uillam*; cf. Col. 2. 18(19) § 2, *manipulos uinciemus*, and Juvenal, 8. 153, *maniplos soluet*. The word for a sheaf is *fasciculus*; see Col. 2. 10 § 13, where it is used of a sheaf of beans. The verbs *uinciemus* and *soluet* show that the hay too, when dry, was made into sheaves or sheaf-like bundles. Since Pliny tells us that two *mergites* were used, we may take *mergae* as a real plural and enter the word as *merga*. Pl. *Poen.* 1018-1020 is mutilated in L. and S. by the omission of essential words. They make it appear that *mergae* were used for digging. The quotation should run:—*palas uendundas sibi ait et mergas datas, | ad messim credo, nisi quid tu*

<sup>1</sup> It is more fully described by Palladius, *de r. r.*, 7. 1 §§ 2-4. In Loudon's *Encyclopaedia of Agriculture* Palladius' description is translated and an illustration is given. It was from this that John Ridley got the first suggestion of his stripper, which he invented in South Australia in 1843-4. Thus South Australia owes its wheatfarms to Pliny and Palladius. See *A Backward Glance* by Annie E. Ridley, p. 382.



aliud sapis, | ut hortum fodiat atque ut frumentum metat, where *hortum fodiat* refers to *palas* and *frumentum metat* to *mergas*, though it is not clear why he says *uendundas*; one would expect *emendas*.

In Virgil, *Georg.* 2. 517, *Cerealis mergite culmi*, editors and dictionaries translate *mergite* 'sheaf.' Of this sense they give no explanation and no other instance. It is clear that the word has the same meaning as in Pliny; it is one of the two forks used for stripping off the ears of corn, and *Cerealis mergite culmi* means 'a forkful of wheat stalks.'

*ofella* is commonly supposed to be a general term, 'ein Bissen, Mundbissen, Stückchen, Fleisch etc.' (K. E. Georges), 'a bite, bit, mouthful, morsel' (L. and S.). In Juvenal 11. 144 Dr. Leeper and Mr. Owen translate it 'scrap.' L. and S. refer to Juvenal, 11. 144, *exiguæ furtis imbutus ofellae*, Martial, 10. 48. 15, *et quae non egeant ferro structoris ofellae*, and 14. 221. 1, *rara tibi curua craticula sudet ofella*. To these add Martial, 12. 48. 17, *me meus ad subitas inuitet amicus ofellas*. Friedländer is vague on Juvenal l.c., 'Ein einfaches, ohne Kunst und Luxus herstellbares Gericht,' but in his Martial, misled by *curua*, he says it seems to be a sausage. Heraeus in his Teubner text of Martial, p. lxii, says that it means 'Rippchen, Cotelette' and adds 'Glossae lat. *φιλόπλευρον* interpretantur inter suilla.' That Heraeus is right is plain from the recipes in Apicius, *de re coq.*, 7. 4. They show that *ofellae* were of pork, for the skin was scored but not removed (§1) and one recipe is *ofellae aprugineo more* (§3); they were cutlets, not chops, for they could be made from the paunch (*de abdomine*, §2) and they were first boned (§2); they were rolled up like beef-olives and fastened with a skewer (*ofellas exossas, in rotundum complicas, surclas*, §2, cf. *surclas decussatim* (you skewer cross-wise), §1)—hence Martial's *curua ofella*—and cooked in various ways, baked in an oven and then dried on a gridiron (§2), baked in an earthenware pan (§4), or fried in a *sartago* (§5) or boiled (§3). In the first recipe they are left in a sauce for two or three days before being cooked. In some of the

recipes there is nothing to indicate what meat was used; this may have been pork, veal, or lamb, but not fish, since fish are dealt with in a separate book and are not mentioned in Book VII.

*opium*. Delete 'poppy-juice.' *opium* is not the fresh juice (*sucus*), but that juice dried and made into balls (Plin., *N.H.*, 20 § 199); it is therefore our opium.

*pampinus*. Much space might be saved in Lewis and Short by cutting out alternative renderings which are obviously erroneous. Latin is a precise language, and anyhow no language would use the same word for leaf, tendril, and shoot. The very first example from Plautus shows that one of the alleged meanings is wrong, for *pampini folio* cannot mean 'with a leaf of a leaf.' We may take it that *pampinus* everywhere means a young shoot and classify the examples under 'I. Lit. a young vine-shoot' and 'II. Transf., a young shoot of any climbing plant.'

*papauer*. Add 'I. B. poppy-seed.' This is the meaning in Plautus, *Trin.* 410, non hercle minus diuorse distrahitur cito | quam si tu obicias formicis papauerem, *Poenulus*, 326, *sesumam papaueremque, triticum et frictas nuces*, where, like the other things, it is an article of food, Petronius, *c.* 1, *dicta . . . quasi papauere et sesamo sparsa*, Lucretius, 3. 196, *papaueris . . . aceruus*, and Virgil, *Aen.* 4. 486, *spargens umida mella soporiferumque papauer*.

*pōticius*, not in L. and S. nor in K. E. Georges nor in Forcellini-DeVit. Plautus, *Bacch.* 123, *quem ego sapere nimio censui plus quam Thalem*, | is stultior es barbaro poticio. This is from \**pōtīcius*, formed like *missicius*, *suppositicius*, *tralaticius*. These adjectives are always passive and are formed from perfect participles passive. For the passive participle *pōtitus* see L. and S. s.v. *pōtio*. 2, where *cum nunc potiuui pater seruitutis* is quoted from *Amph.* 178 and the passive *est potitus hostium* from *Capt.* 92 etc. Hence *pōticius* means 'one who has been taken prisoner in war.' The dropping of one syllable in -titi- is easily paralleled, see Lindsay, *L.L.* 176, and compare *uipēra* from \**uīuipāra*.

*propola* is rendered 'a forestaller, a retailer, huckster.' But in all the pas-



sages where the context enables us to determine the nature of his business, *propola* is a retail seller of eatables (e.g. bread, figs, snails); see the quotations from Lucilius and Cicero in L. and S. and add, from K. E. G., Varro, *de r. r.*, 3. 14 § 3, ruminantes ad propolam uitam diu producunt (*sc. cochleae*). In Salvianus (see K. E. G.) they are coupled with *caupones* and in inscriptions with *piscatores*, cf. Dessau, 3624, *piscatores et propolae*, *ibid.* 6146, *piscator. propolar.* Hence in Plautus, *Aul.* 512, the punctuation *propolae linteones*, *calceolarii* is incorrect. Both *propolae* and *lintheones* are nouns, and neither could qualify the other. *caupones* too in *Aul.* 509 is commonly supposed to be qualified by *patagiarii*, and the line is punctuated *caupones patagiarii, indusiarii*. But wherever the meaning can be determined from the context *caupona* is an inn or tavern and *caupo* an innkeeper. Hence there should be commas after *caupones* and *propolae*. They are in fact cases of *παρά προσδοκίαν*, as though in enumerating the items of a modern young lady's dress-bills one threw in cocktails and cigarettes. Editors and lexicographers are apt to forget that Plautus was a comic poet and usually meant to be funny. What is still more strange, they fall into the etymological fallacy—that of trying to infer the meaning of a word from its etymology. They assume that *propola* had the same meaning as *προπόλης* and suppose that they can discover the meaning of *προπόλης* from its etymology.

The first syllable of *propola* is long in Lucilius (*prōpōla* in L. and S. is a misprint) and the accent in Dessau 6146 indicates that this was the popular pronunciation. In Plautus *l.c.* the quantity of the first syllable is indeterminate. Hence the quantity should be marked *prō-*. For *prō-* from *προ-* see Lindsay, *L.L.*, p. 590, where *prōlogus* from *πρόλογος* and *prōpino* from *προπίνω* are cited.

*quadra*. II. B and C are altogether wrong. *quadra* is not a square but a fourth part of a circle, a quarter of a round loaf which has been divided like a hot cross bun by diameters intersecting at right angles. The word is explained by Marquardt, *Das Privatleben*

*der Römer*, p. 420, by Henry, *Aeneidea*, III. 498-500, by Mr. Duff on Juvenal 5. 2, and by some of the editors of Virgil; Conington's note is obscure, but the notes of Page, Ladewig, and Sabbadini are lucid and accurate. *Moretum*, 47-9, iamque subactum | leuat opus, palmisque suum dilatat in orbem, | et notat impressis aequo discrimine quadris, should be quoted, since it shows how the *quadrae* were formed, and Mart. 9. 90. 18 should be quoted in full, since it shows that the *quadra* was a sector of the divided loaf. The examples should be grouped as follows:—

III. A. A quarter of a round loaf of bread, *Moretum*, *l.c.*, *patulis* . . . Virgil, *l.c.*, *Juv. l.c.*; quis beneficium dixit quadram panis? Sen. *de ben.* 4. 29 § 2. Hence metaph. diuiduo findetur munere quadra, Hor. *l.c.* B. a similar piece of other substances, casei, Mart. 12. 32. 18, *placentae*, *ibid.* 6. 75. 1, 9. 90. 18, *sectā plurima quadra de placenta* etc.

*rapulatus*, cooked with turnips. Not in L. and S. Apicius, *Excerpta* vii. pisces scorpiones *rapulatos* . . . *rapas* elixas . . . cum pisce obligas. From this it is clear that *rapula* was a synonym for *rapa*. Hence *rapulum* should be rendered 'a turnip,' not 'rape,' for rape is eaten by sheep, not by human beings. See also *Companion to Latin Studies*, third edition, p. 79. Add these references: Livy, 23. 19 § 14, Pliny, *N.H.*, 19 § 87 M. Curium . . . rapum torrentem in foco inuentum, Seneca, *Apocolocynt.* 9, qui cum Romulo possit 'feruentia rapa uorare,' Martial, 13. 16. 1, haec tibi brumali gaudentia frigore rapa | quae damus, in caelo Romulus esse solet.

*reclinis* II. 'tabula a projecting shelf or seat' is absurdly wide of the mark. Palladius is describing the Gallic reaping-machine or 'stripper'; the passage runs:—fit itaque uehiculum, quod duabus rotis breuibus fertur. huius quadrata superficies tabulis munitur, quae forinsecus reclines in summo reddant spatia largiora. That is, the planks which form the four sides of the body of the cart incline outwards, so that they form an obtuse angle with its floor.

*robur*. I. 2. 'an oak-tree, an oak in general.' It is clear from Pliny, *N.H.*, 16 §§ 17, 19, 20, 25, 28, 218 that *robur*

is nothing of the kind, but one variety of oak; the other varieties mentioned are *quercus*, *aesculus*, *cerrus*, *ilex*, *suber* (§ 19). There is no general name for an oak.

*Scoti* 'a people in the northern part of Britain, in the modern Scotland.' This, for the authors cited, is erroneous. In the time of Ammianus and St. Jerome the *Scoti* still lived in Ireland. Substitute 'a tribe in Ireland' and for '*Scoticus* . . . of or belonging to Scotland, *Scottish*, *Scotch*' substitute '*Scoticus* . . . of or belonging to the *Scoti*.' Add to the examples *Scotorum* *pultibus* *praegrauat*, S. Hieronymus, *Commentarius in Ieremiam*, *Prologus* (where *Scotorum pultibus* means, not Scotch porridge, but Irish stirabout), and *habet progeniem Scotorum gentis*, de Britannorum uicinia, *ibid.* Lib. III. *ad init.* (From these passages it follows that the celebrated Pelagius or one of his principal supporters was an Irishman.) Under *Scoticus* add Symmachus, *Epistulae*, 2. 76, *septem Scoticorum canum oblatio*, wrongly rendered '*Schottische Hunde*' by Friedländer, *SG.*<sup>8</sup> II. 408 and by Keller, *Die antike Tierwelt*, I. 114. The Irish wolfhound, now extinct, is probably meant. Bury says of the ship in which St. Patrick escaped from his captivity in Ireland 'It was a ship of traders . . . part of the cargo consisted of dogs, probably Irish wolf-hounds' (*Life of St. Patrick*, p. 31).

*sebum* is explained as 'tallow, suet, grease,' and *adepts* as 'the soft fat or grease of animals, suet, lard (the hard is called *sebum*).' Tallow, suet, and lard are not the same thing. Suet is the hard fat on the kidneys and loins of cattle and sheep; tallow is suet melted

down; lard is the corresponding internal fat of pigs when it has been melted down for use in cooking. *adepts* and *sebum* too are quite distinct. According to Pliny, *N.H.*, II § 212, they are produced by different kinds of animals; in 28 § 135 he says the best *adepts* comes from pigs, in § 142 he mentions *lupinus adepts*, in II § 213 human *adipes*, and in 28 § 143 he says *sebum* comes from ruminating animals, cf. 20 § 141 *adipe suillo ac taurino sebo*, 28 § 137 *anseris adipe taurorumque sebo*. Both *adepts* and *sebum* are used of the fat whether in its natural state or melted down, 28 § 143. But pigs' fat, when rendered down, i.e. lard, is called *axungia* (axlegrease), 28 §§ 136, 141; it was used as a medicine *cum illa ferrugine rotarum* or *per se* (§ 141). Hence in French *axonge* is 'lard for ointment,' while 'lard for cooking' is *saindoux* (Bellows' French Dictionary).

*sebum*, then, like its derivative, the French *suif*, is either suet or tallow, *adepts* is not suet.

*spatula*. L. and S. have '\* I. a broad piece: porcina, a leg of pork, Apic. 4. 3. § 174 sqq.' As the phrase *spatulam porcina* occurs four times in Apicius, 4. 3 §§ 4-7, the asterisk should be removed. One can understand the transition from *spatha* to 'a broad piece,' but it will not be easy to discover any bridge from that to 'a leg.' Moreover there are already two words for a leg of pork, viz. *perna* and *petaso*. Since the Italian *spalla* and the French *épaule* are derived from *spatula*, it is fairly safe to assume that it already meant 'shoulder.'

R. L. DUNBABIN.

University of Tasmania.

#### GREEK PARTICLES.

I gratefully accept virtually all the corrections and additions made by Mr. Lorimer in his review of my book (*C.R.* XLVIII 221): but on one or two points I should like to add a word of explanation. (He has been good enough to let me see his reply to these remarks.)

At *Hipp.* 347 '*Hippolytus*' was an unfortunate slip of the pen. I meant

'Phaedra's remoteness (from erotic experience)', and I take the passage as Mr. L. does. As to my punctuation, it is that of Wilamowitz and Murray: and where the sense of the particle in question is not concerned, I do not hold myself responsible for the text I quote (p. ix). On p. 191 I should have said 'a relatively rare use, and almost unknown in post-Homeric Greek'. I was

aware that my list was not exhaustive. But the terms of my definition under I. i would probably exclude many of Mr. L.'s 35 Odyssean examples. (See Ebeling, who only gives some 15 Homeric examples under this heading.) I meant to include those passages alone in which 'but not' is the necessary translation, excluding those where 'and not' or 'nor' will serve. On this principle I should perhaps have omitted γ 141. At Ag. 263 'nor', and at O.C. 481 'and don't', seem conceivable renderings. But I must admit that my classification of these usages is defective.

I still regard the use of οὐ δέ, μὴ δέ, *separatim*, as distinct from that of οὐδέ, μὴδέ (though I should have inserted a cross-reference). Whether or not this orthography rests on an ancient tradition, it makes clear what I believe to be the fact, that the negative in such cases separates itself from the δέ, and bears a stress accent (the distinction in pitch-accent between μὴ δέ and μὴδέ = μὴδέ is of course fictitious). But my analysis on p. 187 lacks precision. Apart from Smp. 199 A, all the examples are of μὴ δέ, not οὐ δέ: and in all of them except Sph. 262E μὴ δέ occurs with a conditional participle expressed or understood, and almost always with the repetition of a word or words. The idiom is even more closely circumscribed than I had supposed.

I must confess that, in writing this book, I never looked at a manuscript, but relied, too confidently, on the *apparatus critici* of standard texts. Hence I never knew that B reads μὴδέ at Plt. 284D, that MSS often write μὴ δέ when the meaning is 'not even,' that they write οὐκ οὐν more frequently than I had thought, and that they do show (occasional) traces of δοῦν. With regard to οὐκ οὐν, οὐκοῦν, οὐκ οὐν, I had over-hastily assumed that the chaos in our printed texts must rest on a dutiful conservatism, since it apparently rests on nothing else. But I had underrated the power of Chance in human affairs. Mr. L. has kindly furnished me with abundant statistics which show how unreliable the *apparatus critici* are on these points.

At Pl. Smp. 173D I should certainly have mentioned μαλακός, which indeed

has preponderant MS authority and the support of eminent scholars: but Apollodorus' reply convinces me that *μανικός* is right.

I should like to say in conclusion that I am much flattered by the favourable opinion of a scholar whose knowledge of the Greek particles is evidently so wide and so deep. It is as well for him that I did not know of this earlier: I should have been a sad nuisance to him.

J. D. DENNISTON.

Hertford College, Oxford.

I might perhaps have guessed that Mr. D. understands the general sense of Eur. Hp. 347 as I do; if I had, I would of course have refrained from criticizing the punctuation adopted by him from the Oxford text, on which I hope to say something further on another occasion.

As regards οὐδέ (μὴδέ) without preceding negative clause, I took Mr. D. to include under p. 191 I, i all cases where the particle has some adversative force but not such as in Attic prose would require ἀλλ' οὐ, and, however he may define a balancing adversative, there does not seem to be anywhere else to put them. I fancy the difference between us is really this, that Mr. D. will not admit adversative force if he thinks he can help it, whereas I assume it wherever I think it suits the context better than the continuative. My 35 was a miscount for 33, for which I apologize, and of these 33 I would now put 1 (κ 342) under Mr. D.'s p. 191 fin. The remaining 32 are α 369, γ 143, ε 81, θ 344, ι 216, 230, κ 26, 214, 246, λ 288, 324, μ 232, 362, 392, ν 125, 243, ξ 524, ο 246, π 160, 475, ρ 234, 278, 293, 490, σ 3, τ 116, 451, φ 35, 150, 184, ψ 202, 315 (this list is not necessarily complete).<sup>1</sup> No doubt Ebeling puts most of these (even θ 344) under *und nicht*, *auch nicht*, but he himself says that many of the examples he puts there might be taken as = *nicht aber*, *aber nicht*, and there are those who so take them. If Mr. D. thinks οὐδ' in γ 143 continuative (= καὶ οὐ), he must think the same of a good many of the others. But even if I am right in claiming them all as adversative, I daresay I should have

<sup>1</sup> Add β 182 (*Gk. Part.* p. 584).

done better to speak of this use as 'relatively rare' (and not 'fairly common') in Homer. In Ae. Ag. 263 'nor' and in Soph. O.C. 481 'and don't' seem to me decidedly unnatural, and I would appear to have the preponderance of scholarly opinion on my side.<sup>1</sup>

I quite recognize that passages like Hdt. v 35, 4, Pl. *Plt.* 284d, etc., do form a group by themselves, and I intended to hint as much when I objected to Mr. D.'s making a 'complete' separa-

<sup>1</sup> In *Ag. l.c.* Davies and Goodwin both render 'nor,' but the other translators I have consulted use an adversative particle:—'albeit' Paley, 'but' Campbell, 'though' Headlam, 'yet' Conington, Kennedy, Morshead, Smyth, 'mais' Mazon. Blomfield prints οὐ δέ. On *O.C. l.c.* Hermann's note is 'Μὴ δὲ hic cum veteribus libris scripsi, non μὲν, quia vere adversativum est δέ.' Campbell, Linwood, Jebb, and Phillimore all translate 'but,' while Masqueray avoids the issue by means of asyndeton. L. and S.<sup>2</sup>, however, restrict adversative μὴ δέ to Epic.

tion between them and those like *a* 369 and treating them as something 'quite' different from these. But I find it hard to agree that they are no more than cross-reference cousins spelling their name differently. Those editors seem to me more scientific who write ΟΤΔΕ and ΜΗΔΕ *divisim* whenever adversative force is present. Surely there is very little difference between ἦγε μὲν, οὐ δ' ἀπόνητο (λ 324) and πειρώμενόν τινα τῶν καλῶν, οὐ χ' ὑπ' ἐραστοῦ δέ (Pl. *Phdr.* 227c).

I would only add that I am very glad to have been given this opportunity for an amicable exchange of views with Mr. Denniston.

W. L. LORIMER.

*University of St. Andrews.*

P.S.—In my review (p. 221, col. 2), Th. vii 77, 2 should be Th. vii 77, 1 and i 42, 3 should be i 42, 4.

#### A NEW FRAGMENT OF MEDEA.

THE vellum scrap (1½ in. x 2½ in.) published below was discovered at Arsinoë by Sir Flinders Petrie many years ago, and is now the property of University College, London. Written in a rounded uncial hand, it may be assigned to the 4th or 5th century. More than half the surface is blank margin, but for all that the text is not without interest, confirming by implication in one case the emendations of a scholar, in another proving the early date of an obvious interpolation. Supplements are from the Oxford text of Murray.

1057 ἔασον αὐτοὺς, ὦ τάλας, φέισαι τέκνω]ρ·  
ἐκεῖ μεθ' ἡμῶν ζῶντες εὐφρανοῦσί σε.  
μὰ τοὺς παρ' Αἰδῆ νεργέτους ἀλάστορας,  
οὔτοι ποτ' ἔσται τοῦθ' ὅπως ἐχ[θροῖς ἐγώ,  
παῖδας παρήσω τοὺς ἐμοὺς καθυ]βρίσαι.

1062 πάντως σφ' ἀνάγκη καθθανεῖν·] ἐκεῖ δ' ἐχρή  
The last line shows the interpolation of ll. 1240, 1241 at this point, as in the main MSS.

1086 σοφ[ίας ἐνεκεν· πάσαισι μὲν οὐ,  
παῦρον] [δὲ γένος—<μίαν> ἐν πολλαῖς  
εἴροις] ἐν ὧς—  
οὐκ ἀπόμυσσον τὸ γυναικῶν·  
καὶ φημι [βροτῶν οἰκτινὲς εἶσαν  
πάμπαν [ἀπειροὶ μὴδ' ἐφύτευσαν  
ταῖ]δας προ[σφέρειν

The arrangement of the ode differs by half a line from the printed text; the first line no doubt ran: πολλαῖς ἤδη διὰ λεπτοτέρων instead of stopping at ἤδη, the shift righting itself at l. 1089. The MSS. have the unmetrical παῦρον δὲ δὴ γένος, and κοῦκ ἀπόμυσσον. Elmsley inserted μίαν and corrected to οὐκ, the latter certainly read by the present MS. and the former by inference.

H. J. M. MILNE.

*British Museum.*

## REVIEWS

### PARALLELS AND ORIGINS.

H. J. ROSE: *Concerning Parallels*. Pp. 23. (The Frazer Lecture, 1934.) Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1934. Paper, 2s.

F. M. CORNFORD: *The Origin of Attic Comedy*. Second Impression. Pp. xii + 252. Cambridge: University Press, 1934. Cloth, 8s. 6d.

IN the Frazer Lecture of 1934 Professor Rose has some wholesome things to say regarding the 'parallels which it has hitherto been customary among members especially of that movement sometimes known as philological anthropology to draw between material taken from the lower cultures and facts handed

down to us from classical antiquity,' and the conditions governing the legitimate use of such material. Thus he is prepared, 'as an impenitent polygenetist,' and without seeking the help of Elliot Smith, to admit that the Maori myth of Papa and Rangi may throw light on the psychology of the primitive creators of Hesiod's tale of Ouranos and Ge, even if the details in the two accounts are at variance. On the other hand, when it comes to close correspondence in detail, as in the case of the systems of divination practised in Etruria and in Borneo, he is willing to contemplate the possibility of some ancient connection between the two peoples in question.

From the illustration 'from the four quarters of the globe' of attested classical customs to the analogical reconstruction of such customs is but a step. In the form given it by its authors (and under what other form shall it be

judged?) the old Attic *Mournful Historie of the Eniautodaimon* has as good a claim to credence as much that passes for gospel truth in the regions of pre-history and comparative philology. Classical scholars have on the whole decided against it, and their doubts have been very reasonably stated by Mr Pickard-Cambridge in *Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy*. None the less the second impression, in 1934, of Professor Cornford's *Origin of Attic Comedy* (originally published in 1914, and apparently not noticed in the *Classical Review*) is a welcome event. Its value (like that of, say, Cauer's *Grundfragen der Homer-kritik*) is independent of the truth or falsity of its thesis, and lies in the stimulus it has given to generations of students to think out for themselves the real problems, ritual or other, presented by the σχήματά τινα of Attic Comedy.

W. M. CALDER.

University of Edinburgh.

### HOMER AND AFTER.

T. A. SINCLAIR: *A History of Classical Greek Literature from Homer to Aristotle*. Pp. viii+421. London: Routledge, 1934. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.

THE form of this book its author is not responsible for; the work is a companion to the *History of Later Greek Literature* (F. A. Wright) and *History of Later Latin Literature* (Wright and Sinclair). It seems to the reviewer a most delicate task to hold the balance between too popular and too technical, too full and too scrappy, when writing in this manner, and Professor Sinclair has not always succeeded entirely; for instance, here and there some untranslated Greek in the text will puzzle the general reader, an occasional minor author is described just fully enough to tell the enquirer practically nothing, and once or twice the avoidance of terms of art has resulted in a misleading statement, as on p. 6, 'lyrical metres are not . . . divided into lines,' meaning apparently that they are not *κατὰ στίχον*, but the wording would probably convey to most beginners the quite irrelevant impression that they are written or printed like prose. How-

ever, for the most part such weaknesses are avoided, not only cleverly but with that real knowledge of the subject, leading to clear exposition, which we have already learned to expect from the editor of the *Works and Days*. It is therefore to be understood that the following list of minor errors or dubious statements is a contribution towards a future revised edition, not an average sample of the generally accurate and attractive contents.

There are a few misprints, as p. 15, l. 18, where 'burned' for 'buried' (twice) makes nonsense of a correct statement; p. 131, where Danae has acquired an unlawful diphthong; p. 177, where the accent of *σχοτεινός* has strayed to the first syllable. Amid much that is well said concerning Homer (e.g., p. 40, on the authorship of the *Odyssey*; p. 26, a very reasonable suggestion as to the relation between the *Iliad* and the *Catalogue*), there are a few bits of modern sentiment which are quite out of place (p. 18, why is Achilles said to throw all loyalty aside when he asks for vengeance? There was no Greek nation for him to be loyal to and he



had renounced allegiance to Agamemnon. P. 24, it is hard to see why anyone but Thersites should be distressed at that rogue's deserved beating. P. 38, if Achilles had experienced a 'change of heart' by the end of X, the Iliad would be a singularly un-Greek poem). P. 74, n. 1, that Hekate was much worshipped in Boiotia is unevicenced save by the passage there in discussion, the Hesiodic 'hymn' in her praise. P. 173, there is nothing fantastic in Herodotos' literally correct statement about Xerxes' army drinking rivers dry; has Professor Sinclair reflected how much water is needed for (perhaps) 150,000 men and their

baggage-animals? P. 193, the Hippocratic oath forbids neither operations, save for stone in the bladder, nor the acceptance of fees for teaching, save from one's own teacher's family. Pp. 381, 382, Isokrates 1 and the fragments of his alleged *ars rhetorica* ought not to be cited as if they were undoubtedly his. P. 386 and elsewhere, *ἐνθύμημα* does not mean a striking thought. There are a few more slips, all minor, of these kinds. But the bulk of the book is of far other quality and commendable as a short manual.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

### THE HUMANISTIC VALUE OF ARCHAEOLOGY.

*The Humanistic Value of Archaeology.*

By RHYS CARPENTER. Pp. 134. (Vol. IV. of the Martin Classical Lectures.) Cambridge, U.S.A.: Harvard University Press (London: Milford), 1933. Cloth, \$1.50 or 6s. 6d.

THIS is a very readable account of the 'methods of behaviour' of the archaeologist in Greece, but the survey is at times somewhat rapid and open to question. To take one matter to which much space is devoted, the date of the adoption of the alphabet by the Greeks. The conclusion—admittedly 'heretical'—repeated from the author's very learned and exhaustive paper in the *A.J.A.* for 1933, is that that cannot have taken place before 700 B.C. The paper will no doubt be duly considered by the palaeographers, but one of the grounds, that we have 'not a single eighth-century inscription,' will be difficult now to maintain. For in the same volume of the *A.J.A.* there is an article on certain sherds from Corinth with a script on them which indicates that writing was far from archaic there about 775-750. That goes to confirm the views of recent writers on the subject.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, there

appears to be no reference to the finds at Râs-es-Shâmra,<sup>2</sup> which show that there was a Phoenician alphabet as early as 1200. It can hardly be that it took the Greeks nearly five centuries to make up their minds to acquire it. A subsidiary discussion deals with the early activities of 'Phoenicians' in Greek waters. The author is strongly (to use Bérard's word) *phénicophobe*, and argues positively, but two points must be noted. No account is taken of the view held by high authorities<sup>3</sup> that the *Φοίνικες* or 'red men' of Homer are just Minoans, and 'the Homeric references to the Phoenicians' are proscribed as late on the authority of those—not named—who have most genuine right to an opinion.<sup>4</sup> That spoils all. And further, as regards the world, or worlds, of Homer, it is not easy to extract a precise view from the statements on pp. 67 and 72.

St. Andrews.

A. SHEWAN.

and Rome, chap. i, and Ullman, *Ancient Writing and its Influence*, chap. iii.

<sup>1</sup> Described by Dr. Naish in the *Quarterly Statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund* for 1932.

<sup>2</sup> Some are named in C.P. XXIV, 343 f.

<sup>1</sup> As Kenyon, *Books and Reading in Greece*

A. D.  
thou  
soc  
Bell  
Mr. D  
by He  
critus  
inspira  
la facu  
certain  
veuses  
psych  
valuab  
most  
Demo  
are pr  
ations  
of me  
emana  
the se  
tive fa  
anima  
gence  
γνηστ  
is, of  
γνηστ  
jectivi  
tus, b  
Delatt  
He co  
doctri  
ff., and  
He  
ment  
upon  
cludes  
larly p  
of suc  
to co  
Reason  
from  
can h  
those  
volves

Bacch  
Pos  
edic  
Lei  
RM  
SNEL  
chang  
NO.

## EARLY THEORIES OF 'POSSESSION.'

A. DELATTE: *Les conceptions de l'enthousiasme chez les philosophes pré-socratiques*. Pp. 79. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1934. Paper, 15 fr.

MR. DELATTE examines the views taken by Heraclitus, Empedocles and Democritus of phenomena attributed to divine inspiration, 'tels l'exaltation des poètes, la faculté prophétique, l'extase mystique, certaines maladies mentales ou nerveuses.' His reconstruction of the psychological theories of Democritus is valuable and convincing, and occupies most of the book. He shows that in Democritus' view all these phenomena are produced by the collision of emanations from without with the soul-atoms of men of suitable temperament; the emanations are not received through the sense-organs, but act on an instinctive faculty, shared by such men with animals and distinct from the intelligence; to this faculty belongs the *γῆσις γνώμη* of fr. 11 (Diels). There is, of course, a difficulty in reconciling *γῆσις γνώμη* with the apparent subjectivity of all knowledge for Democritus, but it seems no greater on Mr. Delatte's hypothesis than on any other. He concludes by tracing Democritus' doctrine in Plutarch, *De def. orac.* 431D ff., and in many passages of Plato.

He is much less happy in his treatment of Heraclitus. Basing himself upon a passage of Chalcidius, he concludes that Heraclitus explained similarly prophetic dreams and the ecstasies of such as the Sibyl; the soul is able to communicate with the 'universal Reason' in sleep because it is freed from the bonds of the body, and this can happen also in the waking state to those who deserve it. This account involves not only what seems a strained

translation of Chalcidius (*rationem nostram . . . quiescentibus animis ope sensuum futura denuntiare*, 'notre raison . . . annonce l'avenir quand nos âmes ne sont pas troublées par le concours des sens'), but also the rejection of the commonly accepted account of Sextus, according to which the soul is deprived of communication with external forces through sleep. The 'private world' of fr. 89 is 'activité psychique,' and as such on a higher grade than the 'common world' of waking life; what then are we to make of frs. 2, 113, 114 ('we must cling to what is common,' i.e. τὸ φρονέειν ὁ λόγος, and not behave ὡς ἰδίην ἔχοντες φρόνησιν), to say nothing of fr. 73 ('we must not act and speak like men asleep')? Mr. Delatte goes on to treat the statement of the identity of Dionysus and Hades (fr. 15) as an expression of the truth that death is the birth to real life, but it is very difficult to believe that Heraclitus came near to the doctrine of *σῶμα-σῆμα*; this would involve the attribution of value to one phase of the eternal flux, whereas 'the way up and the way down is one and the same' (fr. 60). It seems inevitable that any reconstruction of Heraclitus' philosophy must discount some of the evidence, but Mr. Delatte appears peculiarly vulnerable on this point.

His account of Empedocles involves the extremely questionable assumption of complete incompatibility between the scientific and the religious poems; he finds in a passage of Caelius Aurelianus evidence for two sorts of madness, one caused by physical disharmony, and the other, a divine frenzy, by the purification of the soul.

W. HAMILTON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

## A NEW TEXT OF BACCHYLIDES.

*Bacchylidis Carmina cum fragmentis.*

Post F. Blass et G. Suess quantum edidit BRUNO SNELL. Pp. 56+153. Leipzig: Teubner, 1934. Paper, RM. 5.20 (bound, 6.20).

SNELL has made two very sensible changes: he has removed much specu-

lative restoration from the text, and he gives a new metrical apparatus, based on Maas.

Omissions and details excepted, the text differs from Süss's in less than thirty places. Kenyon's numeration is restored; fr. 7 K. is taken from VII

and given to VIII; and there are of course accessions among the fragments. Five passages Snell, unlike Süss, regards as *nondum sanati* (I 180, V 142, IX 13, XI 119, XVII 15). New readings not mentioned in Süss are I 140 τοῦ (Edm.), XVII 72 χερα πέτασσε (Sn.), and those mentioned below.

The metrical change is radical and welcome. Snell believes (rightly) in the dactylo-epitrite, and expounds these matters in a preface which is a model of clarity and conciseness. The result is that the reader can now read; but it may be observed that he will not find the rigorous structure-analysis which, e.g., Schroeder offers in his Pindar. So difficult is it to have it both ways. It is however surely true that such analysis must begin with the establishment of the rhythms.

Some details. In V 160, 191, where the other system accommodated τὰδ' Snell reads τὰδ'. He does well to keep ταχέϊαν ὁρμάν at X. 20. B. is not so subtle as Pindar in accommodating rhythm to sense; when he does, it is a little cruel to rob him of the credit. But in XVII B. is not so sympathetically treated. Βασιλεὺ τῶν ἱερῶν Ἀθανᾶν, τῶν ἀβροβίων ἀναξ Ἴώνων—two glyconics and a bacchiac. But the glyconics have to be expiscated; and surely the verses, each opening with an ionic and closing with a strong suggestion of the anaclastic ionic, are meant to

reflect the ἀβροβίων Ἴώνων while leading naturally to glyconics later on. In fact, this metric is a little at the mercy of its nicknames; glyconics are seen where the real metre seems something more subtle (but anonymous), and phrases are called *cho ba*, *cho dim*, which might well be included as glyconic. 'Nobis non origo versuum investiganda sed ratio Bacchylidis describenda,' says Snell, most reasonably; look then at *Antig.* 100-109, 332-335, and consider whether or not Sophocles at least did not think of -ο-ο-ο-ο-ο- and -οο-ο-ο-ο- as glyconics.

Snell's acceptance of *iambus pro cretico in initio periodi* and of the MS. θέλωσι at XVII 117 is sound; θέωσι, especially with the justifying reference to *Od.* 8, 465, was a bad reading. At *ib.* 102 however I think ἔδεισεν Νηρῆος ὄλβ- a poorer correspondence to Ποσειδᾶν ὑπέρτατον than would be ἔδεισε Νηρῆος ὄλβ-, which is nearer the MS. *Iambus pro bacchio* is justified here too by the easy way in which 6- and 5-time bars alternate in paeonic rhythms.

I note a few misprints. I 37 n., l. θεω'. III 64 n., Pind. Pyth. 2, 55. V 76 del. δ'. XIII (metr. scheme) 60? should apparently be 126. XIII 160 n. ε. should be ἐκπέσαντες, and del. εἴ. III 64 n. ad 18 seems to refer to p. 18.\*

H. D. F. KITTO.

University of Glasgow.

### A TRANSLATION OF THE PARMENIDES.

The *Parmenides* of Plato. Translated into English with Introduction and Appendixes by A. E. TAYLOR. Pp. vi+161. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1934. Cloth, 7s. 6d.

THIS volume represents one more valuable service that Professor Taylor has performed for students of Plato and of Greek thought in general. It contains an admirably written Introduction in which his view, that is by now generally known, of the nature and purpose of the *Parmenides* is put forward: that is, the view that the criticisms in the first part, which probably came from Megarian sources, were not taken very seriously by Plato, and were answered by

him in the second part by an imitation of Megarian methods of argument which showed that these methods could be applied just as destructively to their own fundamental position. This is followed by the translation with explanatory notes. And this in turn is followed by six Appendixes which contain most penetrating discussions of special problems.

My gratitude to Professor Taylor for the work is so great and my agreement with most of his arguments, particularly his general interpretation of the purpose of the dialogue, is so complete that I find it difficult to offer anything in the way of criticism. I may, however, mention one or two questions which

arise  
minor  
lation

(1)  
the  
Profes  
ground  
in that  
and re  
Parme  
is ent  
of Pla  
sible t  
mome  
ment  
home

(2)  
(i) I c  
'the f  
similar  
in En  
just',  
impre  
with t  
of the  
satisf  
find di  
and id  
any cl  
words  
there  
Englis  
etymol  
(3) I  
of Zeno

U. KA  
ange  
(Göt  
Stut  
1934

The pu  
of a ser  
the au  
begun  
has bee  
reason  
sion o  
consid  
Profes  
school  
known  
arrang  
attract

arise in my mind on comparatively minor points of interpretation or translation.

(1) Where does the suggestion that the Forms are thoughts come from? Professor Taylor suggests, with some grounds, a Megarian source. But why, in that case, is it put forward by Socrates and rejected, apparently decisively, by Parmenides? I admit that the notion is entirely foreign to the general lines of Plato's thought. But is it not possible that he played with the idea for a moment, and even that it was an argument with a Megarian that brought home to him how impossible it was?

(2) Two small points of translation. (i) I cannot quite reconcile myself to 'the just equal' for *αὐτὸ τὸ ἴσον* and similar phrases. I am afraid that 'just' in English too readily suggests 'only just', which would give a very wrong impression to a reader unacquainted with the Greek. But I admit that none of the possible alternatives are really satisfactory. (ii) Is it really necessary to find different words in English for *εἶδος* and *ἰδέα*? I have sought in vain for any clear distinction between the two words in their Greek use. Incidentally, there are no two possible words in English which are so closely connected etymologically.

(3) In reading the admirable account of Zeno's work in the first Appendix, I

found myself wondering whether Zeno was quite so exclusively concerned with a particular mathematical theory of Pythagorean origin as the account suggests. I do not feel myself qualified to contest Professor Taylor's interpretation. But I should have expected Zeno to be at least as much concerned to dispose of 'common-sense' beliefs in the possibility of motion as of this particular theory about it.

While on the subject of the Appendixes I should like to draw special attention to the very interesting discussion of the relation between the *Parmenides* and the *Timaeus*. It contains the most convincing arguments that Professor Taylor has yet given us for his view of the way in which Plato arrived at his theory that the Forms were numbers, and of the meaning of his analysis into the One and the Indefinite Dyad. Those, of whom I was one, who were not quite convinced by his previous discussions would do well to consider this much briefer and clearer statement very carefully.

If I started picking out points of special interest this review would extend much beyond the permitted limits. So I will content myself with once more recommending this work as absolutely indispensable to the study of Plato.

G. C. FIELD.

University of Bristol.

## THE PUBLIC LAW OF ATHENS.

U. KAHRSTEDT: *Staatsgebiet und Staatsangehörige in Athen*. Pp. v+370. (Göttinger Forschungen, 4. Heft.) Stuttgart and Berlin: Kohlhammer, 1934. Paper, M. 24.

The publication of this volume, the first of a series on Athens which will complete the author's studies of Greek public law begun by his well-known book on Sparta, has been delayed since 1928 for financial reasons; it gains however by the inclusion of new material. It has all the considerable merits and the defects of Professor Kahrstedt's other work, of the school of which Beloch was the best known member. It is systematic, well arranged, fully documented; clearly and attractively written (and printed); not

encumbered with controversy on the views of others; always interesting. It is also dogmatic where dogmatism is unjustified; and often carries an argument to conclusions which are against the weight of evidence and sometimes involve self-contradiction; like Beloch, he is the victim of complexes (there is no other word for it), such as his dislike of Demosthenes, though he is ready enough when it suits him to believe other demagogues such as Lysias, Aeschines and Pseudo-Demosthenes. But he manages his vast subject, in all its detail, admirably; he is stimulating; and since he gives full references, the reader, if he takes the trouble, can judge for himself.

The first section deals with *das Staats-*



gebiet: Kahrstedt argues that there was no state *Obereigentum* of land in Attica; but there was state-domain in Laureotikê (confiscated from the Peisistratids), and state-ownership of some mines lying beneath private property (acquired also by confiscation or by purchase), as well as private mines—there was thus no *Bergregal*, no law declaring state-property in all minerals beneath the surface. There was however state-ownership of the land in all cleruchies (the extent of which he greatly exaggerates—*Nachr. Ges. Göttingen* 1931, 159 pp.), at least in theory.

The second and much the longer section (over 300 pages) deals with *die Staatsangehörigen*: the citizens—conditions of citizenship, citizen rights (protection of life, property, honour, etc.), taxation and liturgies, the family and the clan—, metics, foreigners, slaves; with an interesting *Beilage* on the Athenian *perioikoi* in Oropus and Eleutherae. There is matter of interest, for argument, on almost every page; and with all his attention to detail, Kahrstedt seldom blurs his picture of the whole. There is only one problem he does not fairly face—the taxation of *ξένοι*: he insists, rightly, that the metics were a privileged class, though privileges entailed burdens as well (just as citizenship entailed still more burdens, as Apollodorus found—*Dem. L.* 26); but he leaves those foreigners who were not metics, yet did much business in Athens, practically untaxed. There are two major matters in which (so I think) he is definitely wrong: in his discussion of the main principles of law, he says (very dogmatically) that there were two, present in every modern *Rechtsstaat*, that were absent in Athens—one that there must be no trial for a crime not in the statute-book, and the other that penalties for crime must be fixed and must be observed by the law-courts; he holds that Athenian juries could try anything they liked and assess any penalty they liked in *δίκαι δημόσιαι* ('der Begriff *ἀτίμητος* hat im athenischen Strafrecht keinen Raum'). It would take far too long to discuss this important question here; but I will take two smaller matters to illustrate my criticism of Kahrstedt's

method. First: he argues that a *νόθος*, both of whose parents were citizens, was himself a citizen (*νοθεία* only affected inheritance), though his principal evidence for this is the Boeotus case (*Dem. xxxix*), and it should be clear that Boeotus claimed not only that Mantias was his father, but that his father and mother were married.<sup>1</sup> He also maintains that admission to a phratry was indispensable to citizenship. But he agrees that some phratries were stricter in their rules than others and insisted on legitimate birth. Suppose Mantias' phratry had been one of these? Kahrstedt does indeed imply on a later page that Boeotus would then have looked for a more amenable phratry; but there will be few who will follow him in this.

Second: he insists that the theoretic fund was never a large sum, never a serious financial burden (as one would suppose from Demosthenes); for one thing, citizens of distant demes would never regularly take their dole—

'alle diese Theorien beruhen auf der Vorstellung, dass Demosthenes nie lügt oder unfehlbar ist. Wenn ein Finanzexperte wie Eubulos anderer Ansicht ist als der Demagoge Demosthenes, wird bei einer Finanzfrage wohl ersterer recht haben. Ferner auf der Vorstellung, dass in Athen jeder Kuhjunge und Schweinehirt sich für die klassische Literatur begeistert hätte.'

(1) To believe in the 'financial expert' Eubulus is as sentimental as to believe in an infallible Demosthenes; (2) would Demosthenes have risked his popularity with the crowd for a bagatelle? and (3) on the very next page Kahrstedt asserts that citizens got their doles in their own deme from the demarch,<sup>2</sup> and that the dole was not a ticket for the festival, but actually 2 obols; which a man could then spend as he liked.

A. W. GOMME.

University of Glasgow.

<sup>1</sup> That is why he insists on his claim to his paternal grandfather's name: he was Mantias' eldest son. To call him, the eldest, Boeotus, after his maternal grandfather, was to imply that he was illegitimate.

<sup>2</sup> Only, according to Kahrstedt, would members of distant demes living in Athens be debarred by the long journey from getting their obols: that is, poor Marathonioi in Athens would not get to the theatre, those in Marathon would get their dole and spend it on a drink.



## ARISTOTLE'S CONCEPTION OF THE SOUL.

E. E. SPICER: *Aristotle's Conception of the Soul*. Pp. xi + 236. London: University of London Press, 1934. Cloth, 8s. 6d.

THE authoress of this book shrouds herself in a certain mystery, but I infer from the bibliography and from other hints that she is a student of psychology who wished to expound Aristotle's doctrine of the soul and to show how it 'culminates and gains new power in his ethical theory,' and to this end has analysed the treatises and untiringly noted all the divergences of the commentators. But amidst all these cares she has forgotten to write the book itself, and merely presents us with the unformed  $\delta\lambda\eta$  out of which a book might have been composed. Nor has the authoress used her knowledge of psychology in considering who her readers are, or what sort of impression she is likely to make on them. The book is, no doubt, designed for psychologists who have not time to study Aristotle for themselves. There are then certain rules which need to be observed: if quotations are given, they should be

striking and easily intelligible: if commentators are mentioned by name, it should be rarely and on points of evident importance: there should be comparison, illustration, generalization. A glance at this book shows that it defies all these rules; the main part of it is a string of quotations, mostly unintelligible to people who have not read the treatises themselves; the ding-dong argument between commentators becomes very wearisome; there is no attempt to sum up; and the main task of connecting the *de Anima* and the *Ethics* is not even begun. On the other hand, to those who know Aristotle there is nothing here that is of much use; they do not want a summary of his treatment of Courage, Temperance, Magnificence and so forth, even if it were a summary which really summarized instead of quoting. Further, the authoress should have attempted to discover something about Aristotle's development; a subject like this cannot now be treated entirely without reference to it.

D. J. ALLAN.

Balliol College, Oxford.

## ATHENIAN FOREIGN POLICY FROM 404 TO 338.

P. CLOCHÉ: *La politique étrangère d'Athènes de 404 à 338 avant J.-C.* Pp. 343. Paris: Alcan, 1934. Paper, 40 fr.

THOSE who have been accustomed to read with great respect all that M. Cloché writes about the history of Greece in the IVth century B.C. will find no reason to be disappointed with this volume, in which he traces the fluctuations of Athenian foreign policy, and the alternations of success and failure with which it met. The treatment of the subject throughout is clear and concise, and never strays far from the evidence. Where the interpretation of the evidence is disputed, M. Cloché treats it with the firm common sense which is characteristic of his work, and never inclines to the more extravagant theories by which some other writers display their lack of judg-

ment. It is inevitable that most of the book should be devoted to the last 20 years of the period, the interest of which is more intense and the evidence much more full. But in the first seven chapters (pp. 5-147), which cover the years 404-357 B.C.—on the whole an ignoble period relieved by very little first-class ability in statesmanship or even in military and naval command—his careful study makes many turns of policy intelligible which historians are often content to put down to mere inconsistency, and some of the most interesting passages in his book are those which discuss and elucidate the policy and personality of Callistratus. Throughout the volume we are given a very distinct picture of the conflict of ideas at Athens,—of the 'patriot-party' always anxious for an opportunity for reviving the military and imperial great-

ness of Athens, and the peace-party, consisting largely of the richer men who were not eager to part with their money. In this reluctance M. Cloché sees the main cause of the ultimate failure of Athens in the conflict with Philip, though he sometimes finds a more respectable reason than this for her inactivity. His presentation of the policy of Demosthenes from point to point is as convincing as it is appreciative, and he sets aside quietly and sensibly the notion, which at one time

threatened to become popular with writers on the period, that Demosthenes was virtually the agent of Persian policy. The actions of Aeschines he regards as prompted less by corruption than by want of intelligence and statesmanship. Unfortunately space does not permit any reference to many passages of particular interest in the book, but it is one which any serious student of the fourth century must read.

A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE.

*University of Sheffield.*

### MORE OF THE LLOYD COLLECTION.

E. S. G. ROBINSON: *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum*: Volume II. The Lloyd Collection. Parts III-IV. Velia to Eryx. 16 plates and letterpress. London: Published for the British Academy by Humphrey Milford and Spink and Son, 1934. Paper, 15s.

It is pleasant to find the *Sylloge* continuing its stately march with a regularity that is not always characteristic of serial publications. The present instalment, like its immediate predecessor, is a double part, while the material is again drawn wholly from Dr Lloyd's wonderful cabinet. Beginning with Velia, it completes Magna Graecia and gives more than a glimpse of the marvels of Sicily. Where wealth is so evenly distributed, it is almost invidious to particularize. But there would probably be general agreement that Agrigentum stands out conspicuously. An exceptionally fine selection of its older coins leads up to the magnificent and very rare dekadrachm. In this piece, long known through the specimen in Munich, the art of the die-engraver reaches its very highest level. The representation of the quadriga on the obverse, if less restrained than on the masterpieces of

Kimón and Euainetos at Syracuse, leaves an even stronger impression of life and movement, while it would be difficult to imagine anything more perfectly balanced than the design on the reverse, which furnishes an apt pictorial comment on a familiar passage in the *Agamemnon*.

If coins are the grammar of Greek art, there could be no more alluring and delightful text-book for beginners than the *Sylloge*. The format is excellent, being large enough to admit of ample spacing without any feeling of emptiness. As a rule, too, the technique of the plates is admirable. This is specially so in the case of some of the bronze pieces, often of very high artistic quality in Sicily. But it is not beginners alone who will find the *Sylloge* useful. Mr Robinson's descriptive notes, brief as they are, are packed full of information that will be valuable to the specialist. The British Academy are to be congratulated on the progress of an undertaking which is destined to be a real boon to scholarship. The price is most moderate.

GEORGE MACDONALD.

*Edinburgh.*

### STUDIES IN ANCIENT SEACRAFT.

AUGUST KÖSTER: *Studien zur Geschichte des antiken Seewesens*. Pp. 155, 15 illustrations and a map. (Klio, Beiheft 32.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1934. Paper, M. 10 (bound, 11.60).

THIS book is a collection of eight essays. No. 1 decides that the recorded measurements of Ineni's obelisk transport are sound. No. 2 explains the towing-stone of Herodotus II, 96, on the principle of

the s  
struc  
IV;  
genu  
row-  
πρρ  
the  
right  
was  
two  
mean  
Köst  
vesse  
Char  
whic  
expl  
north  
an u  
list o  
regu  
chan  
the  
mon  
inter  
bone  
five  
ing  
mis  
the  
Phor  
κιν  
(first

Roya  
Pe  
Pp  
Ha  
do  
PRO  
lated  
is far  
lished  
denco  
histo  
how  
been  
of ro  
their  
other  
pages  
which  
the el  
come  
the r

the sea-anchor. No. 3 gives a new reconstruction of the *thalamegos* of Ptolemy IV; Köster concludes that it was a genuine ship but had to be towed by row-boats. But his explanation of *διππῆρος* and *διπρυμνος* as two decks in the bow and stern sections cannot be right, for Ptolemy IV's 'forty,' which was also *διππῆρος* and *διπρυμνος*, had two decks throughout. It certainly means a double hull of some sort; Köster, though he knows many strange vessels, has missed the double-hulled Channel ferry-boat *Calais-Douvres*, which would have helped him. No. 7 explains certain pictures of vessels on northern rocks as developed rafts with an upper platform, and gives a useful list of ancient rafts (add Agatharchides' regular use of *σχεδιαί* for Arab merchantmen); the heads of dragons on the prows are magic to keep off sea-monsters, an attractive idea. No. 8 interprets the 'first German ship,' on a bone from the Weser, as Roman. These five studies are excellent. The remaining three are connected through Artemisium. No. 5 explains the *κύκλος* of the Corinthians in their battle with Phormio as inspired by the successful *κύκλος* of the Greeks at Artemisium (first day); but this latter *κύκλος*, though

it is what Herodotus says, raises questions which are not considered. No. 4 goes through the naval operations which ended with Artemisium. It has some good explanations of Herodotus' text, and I think proves that the second storm was not a doublet; but his discovery that a fleet could not get from Therme to C. Sepias in one day, a fact which he says no one has taken into account, was proved by myself in 1908-9, and Macan also gave more than one day; and he makes the Persians try to *envelope* an enemy fleet whose line, he says, stretched from shore to shore! But the real faults of this study are absence of any thorough criticism and acceptance of exaggerated Persian numbers with their concomitants. No. 6 gives his reason for this acceptance—a simple argument in a circle—followed by some well-known reasons why Persia lost the naval war. He decides that their navy fought Salamis because the land command ordered it; just so, but there is much more to it than that. Köster knows a great deal about many sorts of shipping, and on his own ground his work is fresh and valuable; but the historical studies are less successful.

W. W. TARN.

*Inverness.*

#### ROYAL CORRESPONDENCE.

*Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period.* By C. BRADFORD WELLES. Pp. c+405; 12 illustrations. New Haven: Yale University Press (London: Milford), 1934. Cloth.

PROFESSOR WELLES is to be congratulated on a fine piece of work; his book is far the most thorough thing yet published on Hellenistic royal correspondence, and will be warmly welcomed by historians, especially those who know how useful Schroeter's collection has been. A short introduction on the use of royal letters in diplomacy and on their style, including their neglect or otherwise of rhetoric, is followed by fifty pages of minute analysis of the language, which among other things distinguishes the elements taken from the Koine; later come sixty-six pages of examination of the more important words of the vo-

cabulary; all this should be of great value to the student of Hellenistic Greek. The body of the work comprises seventy-five texts, each with translation and full commentary. The completeness of the book in every particular is notable; there are facsimiles of twelve letters, a sixteen-page list of works cited, a comparative table of editions, and seven indices. The texts are chiefly royal letters 'inscribed on stone in Asia or on islands in Asiatic waters,' but among them are a few covering letters from officials. The total is smaller than that in Schroeter, owing to the omission of Antigonid letters, letters of the Ptolemies found in Egypt (omitted as being administrative rather than diplomatic documents), and some trifling fragments, but twelve texts not in Schroeter are given, largely letters from officials but including two im-

portant recent discoveries: no. 45, the letter of Seleucus IV to Seleuceia in Pieria, the editing of which was one of the last things Holleaux lived to do, and no. 75, the invaluable letter, published by M. Cumont, from Artabanus III of Parthia to Susa. As to authorship, Welles' view is that at first kings themselves *may* have written, as possibly the letter of Antigonos I to Scepsis, but that letters soon became a matter for the secretary's bureau, though the personal note in the letter of Ptolemy II to Miletus is duly pointed out; the test of whether or no officials be named without their titles is not considered. The commentaries give full references down to 1932, and much information. Naturally I cannot go into detail; but I might just mention two things which have never, I believe, been brought together. With the well-known crux *εἰς τὸ κατὰ*

*στράτειαν γαζοφυλάκιον* in the letter of Antiochus II to Metrophanes (discussed p. 98) compare the otherwise unknown word *καταστράτεια* on two Parthian coins, rightly taken by Sir G. F. Hill to be the noun of *καταστρατεύομαι*; these two occurrences of *καταστράτεια* ought to have the same meaning, and they suggest that Antiochus' phrase is merely a loose apposition, meaning 'into the expedition treasure-house,' i.e. the treasure-house where the expeditionary fund was kept.

Every user of this book will look forward to the promised future volume, which will comprise the letters from Greece, Macedonia, and Egypt. I hope that it may be possible to include the difficult royal letters in Josephus.

W. W. TARN.

*Muirtown, Inverness.*

#### PORTITOR ILLE CHARON.

FRANZ DE RUYT: *Charun, démon étrusque de la mort*. Pp. xii + 305; 58 plates and sketch-map. Brussels: Lamertin, 1934. Paper, 40 francs.

NOT a little nonsense has been written and many hasty theories put forward concerning the religion of Etruria, as also concerning many other matters whereof we have none but archaeological information in any sufficient quantity. All the more reason therefore to welcome a book by a writer evidently sober as well as learned. Mr. de Ruyt writes with the modest intention of putting together all the information he can find concerning Charun (*charun*), the grim figure of many Etruscan works of art, and so trying to determine his nature and origin, so far as that seems possible. There was room for such a monograph, for the other attempts in the same direction are no longer in accord with the present state of Etruscology. There are collected here 162 monuments of various kinds whereon Charun appears either certainly (his name is appended in four specimens) or with practical certainty, arising from the close resemblance of the figure to those which are thus labelled, or at least with some degree of probability.

A few pieces are then discussed on which some critics have sought for Charun, but, in the author's opinion, erroneously. Next, the figure is described, on the basis of the monuments; he is almost always armed with a great hammer or mallet (nine exceptions), although he almost never uses it to strike (four examples only). He is grotesquely ugly and savage-looking, having a huge hooked nose, bestial ears, a large mouth which generally opens in a laugh to show formidable teeth, and, as a rule, dark blue flesh. Other attributes are less constant, though he nearly always wears high boots, and there are some hellenizing monuments in which he has something of the milder and less terrifying appearance of Thanatos. It is quite rare, despite his name, to find him assimilated to Charon in his usual capacity as ferryman. Regularly, he is the messenger of death, appearing in scenes of combat, human sacrifice, or natural death. Regularly, also, he executes his task roughly and with a grim relish. He is not the lord of the underworld, nor a tormentor of the damned, —this last is rather the business of Tuchulcha, that yet more hideous phantasm of Tuscan imagination,—but

is often the keeper of the gate of Hades. It is suggested that the ultimate origin of this and similar demons is to be sought in Asia, where Assyrian art of the seventh century presents us with not dissimilar monsters.

I hope, in a fuller review of this work in *Gnomon*, to discuss some details, including a few minor errors, for which there is not space here.

H. J. ROSE.

*University of St. Andrews.*

### ROME AND THE GREEKS IN THE FOURTH CENTURY.

WILHELM HOFFMANN: *Rom und die griechische Welt im 4. Jahrhundert*. Pp. viii+144. (Philologus, Supplementband xxvii, Heft 1.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1934. Paper, M. 7.50 (bound, 9).

THIS book is divided into three parts, of which the first deals with the political history of the Roman expansion in the fourth century in so far as it affected the Greeks of southern Italy; the second with the Greek influences on Roman religion which are to be observed in the same period; and the third with the effect produced by the rise of Rome upon Greek minds, as it is reflected in the speculations and inventions of Greek tradition relative to the foundation of Rome and the early 'history' of the Roman state. The political relations are well and clearly described, and the author rightly concludes that in her earliest contracts with the Greeks (with Alexander of Epirus, with Naples, and later with Thurii) Rome was impelled by a desire to use them as her tools for an immediate political end, namely the destruction of the Samnite power: Tarentum, however, was hostile from the first, originally in sympathy with the Samnites, later as the champion of Greek Italy. He insists, perhaps too much, that in the fifth century Italy had been divided into 'an Etruscan and a Greek part, each politically and cul-

turally independent of the other': for although this is mainly true of the political state of Italy, and is illustrated by the Roman policy until a date comparatively late in the fourth century, yet it overlooks the influence of Greek culture upon Etruria, which is explicit in his own account of one of the earliest appearances of Greek influence upon the culture of Rome herself, the *lectisternium*. The section devoted to this phenomenon is excellent, and builds up a very strong case in favour of an intercourse with Southern Etruria (Caere), rather than with Campania, as the immediate instigator of this early foreign addition to the simpler rituals of old Rome.

The Roman *Geist* is, naturally, not forgotten, and on the whole the author treats it with mercy (pp. 3-17). If he reads 'eine Aenderung seiner geistigen Haltung' between the lines of the second treaty with Carthage (a bold effort indeed, and not a perfectly convincing one), yet his conclusion contains no intrinsic improbability, since it is merely that the Romans about 350 B.C. had achieved a political 'awareness' which they had not possessed at the time of the earlier treaty—whenever that may have been.

G. T. GRIFFITH.

*Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge.*

### A SURVEY OF CLASSICAL ROMAN LITERATURE.

DEAN PUTNAM LOCKWOOD, Ph.D., Professor of Latin, Haverford College: *A Survey of Classical Roman Literature*. Vol. I. Pp. xvi+334. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1934. Cloth, \$2.50.

THE present reviewer has great sympathy with the belief that those whom we call pass students in a British University, if they include Latin in their

course, should not be restricted, after the traditional fashion, to reading a few isolated books, but should be encouraged to connect their authors into something like a synthesis by means of a general acquaintance with the development of Roman literature. Such is one of the aims in this volume, which gives texts and letterpress required for the first



(about 44 lectures) of two semesters in an American college. The pedagogical principles upon which the work is based have been set forth in two articles by the author, 'The Haverford Plan,' *Journal of Higher Education*, June 1930, and 'Latin in the College,' *Education*, June 1934. The work in its two volumes is to comprise a complete fifth-year Latin course designed to crown school studies with a rapid survey of classical Roman literature, tracing its evolution and illustrating important phases of Roman civilization through selections from literary masterpieces. It is meant to be a finishing course for many who will take no more Latin, and an orientation course for those who will deepen their knowledge of the subject.

The Introduction deals briefly with the characteristics of Latin literature in its native qualities and in its relation to Greek, and the extracts begin with fragments of the older writers, Andronicus and Naevius. Plautus is generously represented by some 75 pages (from three plays) in the confidence that his

vigour will appeal to the student, though it is not expected that the whole of the portions given can be read in lecture. After Ennius and Cato come over 40 pages for Terence; suggestive portions from the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, including the definition of the three typical styles; then, for the final period in this volume, Caesar, Cicero (to represent his letters, rhetoric and philosophy), Lucretius and Catullus, to whom are assigned 40 pages drawn from his *vers de société*, epithalamia, elegies and poems to Lesbia.

The anthology is sensibly chosen and is unhackneyed. Careful attention is paid to metre, and there are 80 pages of notes. The printing is good, though not immaculate (e.g. parts of *accommodare* are misspelt on p. 153 and p. 160). The second volume, which has yet to come, is intended to represent literature from Sallust to Suetonius and Gaius. This stimulating method deserves success.

J. WIGHT DUFF.

Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

#### THE LANGUAGE OF OLD LATIN POETRY.

HEINZ HAFFTER: *Untersuchungen zur alllateinischen Dichtersprache*. Pp. vii+153. (Problemata, Heft 10.) Berlin: Weidmann, 1934. Paper, RM. 10.

DR. HAFFTER sets out to examine two features of the style of Latin Comedy, its close connexion with colloquial idiom and its use of elevated forms of expression, and to discover how these two tones interplay and how they are related to the obvious formal difference between *senarii* on the one hand and *Langverse* and *cantica* on the other. One of the most familiar phenomena of the comic style is the *figura etymologica* in its various forms: he finds that the use of this type of expression in *senarii* is confined to a limited number of cases belonging to colloquial idiom which can be paralleled from Cicero's Letters and a few others where it is used for raising of tone in reflexions and the like, while in *Langverse* it is used much more freely, as in tragedy and epic. In *senarii* the use of pleonasm

and anaphora is confined to formulistic expressions and the natural redundancies of *Umgangssprache*, such as excited double questions: in *Langverse* it is a deliberate *Stilmittel* for the heightening of the tone, as it is in early prose and poetry generally till Lucretius. The use of circumlocutory phrases and the use of abstract nouns as subjects of transitive verbs are common features of *Langverse*: in *senarii* the latter is restricted as it is in conversational speech, while the former hardly appears at all. In tragedy these differences are not found: the separation of *genera* marked by differences of style is confined to comedy. Perhaps Dr. Haffter's arguments might have been clearer if they had been more concisely put, and he is a little inclined to elaborate what is obvious: but his work shows a keen appreciation of language and is as valuable for the illustrative detail which he adduces as for the conclusions which he draws. The last chapter makes a comparison between

Plautus and Terence on the basis of their use of *Umgangssprache*—Terence's preference for 'simple' interjections of the *vah*-type and Plautus's for 'secondary' interjections of the *hercle*-type, the frequency of *heus* in Plautus and of *hem* in Terence, Terence's liking for elliptic expressions and particularly for elliptic *non* in replies, and his avoidance of such colloquial turns of expression as *paenissume*, *parce parcus*, *propere ocus*.

The difference between Plautus and Terence in this respect is not that of period or stratum but a difference of dramatic technique. Plautus uses the resources of colloquial speech to give his dialogue natural vigour and raciness: Terence, as the Latin Menander, stylizes them and turns those which he uses to new issues in representing the play of  $\eta\theta\eta$ .

C. J. FORDYCE.

University of Glasgow.

### EXITS AND ENTRANCES IN ROMAN COMEDY.

MARY JOHNSTON: *Exits and Entrances in Roman Comedy* (Plautus and Terence). Pp. vii+152. Geneva, New York: W. F. Humphrey Press, 1933. Paper.

PROFESSOR JOHNSTON's object is to determine the stage settings required for each play, the use of the *angiportum*, the question of interludes, and above all the significance of the side-entrances. Her thorough study of the plays leads her to interpret Vitruvius' description (5. 6. 8) of the *uersurae procurentes quae efficiunt una a foro altera a peregre aditus in scenam* in the sense that on the right (from the spectators' point of view) is the entrance *a foro*; on the left that *a peregre*, including both *a portu* and *rure*. The *angiportum* is occasionally employed for purposes usually specified in the play, but is not the regular entrance from or exit to town, harbour or country. Characters normally return to the stage on the side by which they have gone out, and awkward meetings between those going out and those entering can be avoided by assuming an interlude (if the stage is otherwise empty). Interludes serve, also, to convey at will the impression that time has elapsed. Professor Johnston gives us a plan for each play, showing the buildings required in relation to the side entrances. Her chief difficulty is the lack of evidence. Only in five plays is there some definite indication of left and right. A doubtful light is afforded by the miniatures in certain MSS of Terence; Professor Johnston has made a special study of the miniatures in Vaticanus 3828, obtaining a result which, she claims, mainly supports her views. No doubt if opportunity had offered she would

have extended her study to the other MSS which have miniatures, and would have discussed the value of such evidence.

The main conclusion with regard to *forum* and *portus* agrees with the views expressed by Lorenz, Hauler, Sonnenschein and others, and seems to square with the evidence; passages such as *Amph.* 333 and *Men.* 355-7 are impressive, and can be supported by *Rud.* 156-7, 176; *And.* 734 and *Eun.* 835 also seem to us, after we have read Professor Johnston's remarks, to bear out her theory. In putting *rus* to the spectators' left she is on more doubtful ground. We would fain agree with her, but find a difficulty with regard to the *Casina*. She sets the stage thus (p. 22):

Left		Right
Lysidamus'		Alcesimus'
House		House

Now the mock wedding-procession sets out at l. 814 from Lysidamus' house, ostensibly for the country (cf. ll. 782-3) but really for the house of Alcesimus (cf. ll. 477-87). Are we to suppose that under the eyes of his wife and the whole household Lysidamus leads the 'happy pair' in the wrong direction?

Two other small points: there is something inexplicable about the metrical note on *angiporta* (p. 37), and the appeal by Sannio to *populares* (p. 114; *Ad.* 155) in no way suggests a previous choral interlude by certain *populares*; the appeal is similar to that in *Rud.* 615.

Our thanks are due to Professor Johnson for her thorough discussion of a subject which editors have too often treated in a confused and unsatisfactory way.

W. BEARE.

University of Bristol.

## THE CIRCLE OF SCIPIO.

*A Study of the Scipionic Circle.* By RUTH MARTIN BROWN. [See C.R. XLVIII, 246.]

THIS dissertation is an attempt to extend backwards and forwards in time the date of the Scipionic Circle by the claim that it not merely included the literary coterie which gathered round Scipio Aemilianus in the second century B.C., but had its foundation in the philhellenism of Scipio Africanus Maior and passed through an early period, a middle period, and, after the death of Scipio Aemilianus in 129, a final period under the leadership of Laelius Sapiens and then Q. Lutatius Catulus. The authoress assigns 15 names to the early period, 27 (a considerably higher number than ever before suggested) to the middle period, and 10 to the final period. On all of these biographical notes are given. Rather strangely, Blossius of Cumae is left out.

It should be remembered that we have, as justification for the phrase 'Scipionic Circle' applied to the middle period, Cicero's own statement about P. Africanus, C. Laelius and L. Furius that they *secum eruditissimos homines ex Graecia palam semper habuerunt* (*De Orat.* II. 37) and his words, put in Laelius' mouth, about Scipio's pre-eminence *in nostro, ut ita dicam, grege* (*De Amic.* XIX. 69). But for the early period we seem to have no ancient authority recording coherence enough

from which clearly to infer membership of a 'Circle.' That some of the ultimate roots of the 'Scipionic Circle' in the ordinary sense ran back to the philhellenism of Africanus Maior and several of his contemporaries is not to be denied; but the authoress would have been on safer ground in tracing the influence of such men as making the 'Scipionic Circle' possible and paving the way for it rather than in extending the phrase after 'revamping' (p. 14) the commonly accepted definition. The temptation, after taking the earlier 'Circle' for granted, is to find members for it, and in some cases include them dogmatically on slight grounds. There is an extraordinary monotony in the use of 'must' on pp. 29-30: 'must have' occurs 6 times on p. 55, and 'may have' 7 times on p. 56. Cicero should not be credited with writing *incredibile virtute*, p. 54, nor yet *inimicissimius*. In the quotation from Bernhardt, p. 16, an essential word, *verherrlicht*, is omitted, and *Vorturtheil* is a misprint.

Readers will find the study useful as an account of Greek influences in Rome and of many philhellenic figures whom the present reviewer would prefer to regard as immediate predecessors or successors of the 'Circle.'

J. WIGHT DUFF.

Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

## ANCIENT LEADERSHIP.

MAX POHLENZ: *Antikes Führertum: Cicero de Officiis und das Lebensideal des Panaetios*. (Neue Wege zur Antike, II. Reihe, Heft 3.) Pp. iv+148. Leipzig und Berlin: Teubner, 1934. Paper, RM. 7.60.

THIS is a work which needs attentive study alongside of Cicero's text. It consists of a careful analysis of all the main sections of the first two books of the *De Officiis*—or rather, much more than an analysis, it is an elaborate commentary not merely upon Cicero's thought in relation to Panaetius, but

upon Panaetius' ethics in relation to earlier Greek philosophy. Thus a great deal of Cicero's treatise is illustrated by citation from Plato, Aristotle and other Greek thinkers; and it is made clear, as occasion offers, how much Panaetius departed from the teaching of the ancient Stoa. Indeed, in connexion with his psychological examination of *σωφροσύνη*, the author shows that Panaetius' treatment was enough to make the hair of an orthodox Stoic stand on end. He had travelled so widely and seen so much of the world

that he was unlikely to subscribe to dogmatic paradoxes about the moral indistinguishability of human types or about the equal heinousness of every fault. The question had to arise 'Was it in accord with nature to demand the same ethical standard from a Syrian slave as from a Roman aristocrat?'

The discussion of the two books is followed by a section on the date of Panaetius' work; then a final chapter on his 'Lebensideal,' after sketching the attitude of previous philosophers, summarizes his position that voluntary service rendered by a high-principled leader to the community is the highest form of moral action. Here, as against the individualistic tendencies of his own school, he recognized the claims of social and political service. The

emphasis laid on this explains the title of the treatise; and Panaetius' modified Stoicism made it acceptable to the Roman mind and to the Scipionic Circle. The ideal of the Scipionic day was revived, at least theoretically, in Cicero's dream of a new Scipio fit to guide the republic.

At the end there is a fourfold 'Register' of proper names and of German, Greek and Latin terms; but some entries scarcely do full justice to the text: e.g. the two for 'Epikur' do not represent all the references to him and his philosophy. For anyone seriously interested in the thought of the *De Officiis* this work is essential.

J. WIGHT DUFF.

Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

### DE FINIBUS, BOOK III.

MAXIMILIAN SCHÄFER: *Ein frühmittelstoisches System der Ethik bei Cicero*.

Pp. xvi+334. Munich: Salesianische Offizin, 1934. Paper boards.

No one interested should miss this exhaustive study of Cicero's sources for Stoic ethics, though the long periodic sentences, with clauses in three languages, take some unravelling. It traces the development of the τέλος by the Old and the Middle Stoa, their doctrine of Good and Value, and that of καθήκοντα. It shows, from Greek sources when available, how these tenets of the Middle Stoa are expounded by Cicero; and that he follows one Greek authority, probably Antipater (to whom anonymous fragments in Plutarch and Philo are assigned), whereas in *De Officiis* he follows Panaetius. The exclusion of pleasure from οἰκεία is Antipater's, and so is the definition of τέλος *ut omnia faciat quo propositum assequatur*, § 29. Madvig tentatively suggests Diogenes of Seleucia, but admits that one place in Cicero tells against this.

The Middle Stoic doctrines set out are tabulated, and it is suggested that the plan of *De Finibus* is owed to Antiochus's περί τέλους. The three expository books are mere transcripts, but the critical II and IV have much of Cicero's

own. 'De Finibus' is *pluralis maiestaticus* = 'de fine'; cf. 'De Officiis' = περί καθήκοντος, and two works called περί τελῶν by Diogenes, περί τέλους elsewhere. But I would urge that two other interpretations are possible, (1) 'different views as to the chief good and evil,' cf. *Ac. II 132 omnibus eis finibus bonorum quos exposui malorum fines esse contrarios*, (2) 'de finibus bonorum et malorum' = 'de fine bonorum et fine malorum'—so Philippon. In his letters Cicero refers to his work as περί τελῶν merely, so Mr. Schäfer thinks the addition of *bonorum et malorum* is his own; τέλος ἀγαθῶν, τέλος κακῶν occur once only in extant Greek, τέλος ἀγαθῶν καὶ κακῶν never.

A few specimen notes:

Cicero's translation of ζῆν κατ' ἐμπειρίαν τῶν φύσει συμβαινόντων, *uiuere cum intellegentia rerum earum quae natura euenirent* (II 34), is correct, not the recent version 'mit der Natur einstimmend'; though ultimately they come to the same.

His methods of rendering Greek terms: failing an exact equivalent, he allows himself *uerbum nouum* or *inauditum*, e.g. *praepositum*, *reiectum* for προ-, ἀπο-προηγμένον (add *finis* for τέλος—to Roman ears 'finis' meant τελευτή, cf. 'final' with the man in the street to-

day); or several words or even a clause; a Latin word used in a technical sense is apologized for by *appellemus, scilicet*, etc.; or alternatives are given, *rerum cognitiones uel perceptiones*=καταλήψεις, *posterum et consequens*=τὸ ἐπιγενησόμενον; and instead of Greek uniformity Cicero varies his terms in different contexts—a table is given.

III 16 *hinc enim est ordiendum*, 'the starting-point is οἰκείωσις', qualifies the whole sentence.

17 *est nemo quin, cum utrumque liceat, aptas malit et integras omnes partes corporis*—Antipater's διδόντων τῶν πραγμάτων and μάλλον αἰρεῖσθαι.

21 *simul autem cepit intellegentiam uel notionem potius quam appellant* ἔννοιαν

*illi, uiditque rerum agendarum ordinem et ut ita dicam concordiam*—alternative renderings as noted above; with *intellegentiam et notionem* understand *rerum agendarum ordinis*, obj. gen. ὁμολογουμένως τῇ φύσει ζῆν—φύσις in Stoic ethics=the nature of man as a rational being, cf. V 36 *quid hominum natura postulat*? With ὁμολογία always understand τῇ φύσει, though harmony with the λόγος is implied, ὁμο-λογεῖσθαι=κατὰ τὸν ὀρθὸν λόγον: indeed as λόγος is part of φύσις there is no real difference.

68 The wise man's duty to engage in politics and to have a family is Antipater.

H. RACKHAM.

Christ's College, Cambridge.

### SALLUST AS HISTORIAN.

W. SCHUR: *Sallust als Historiker*. Pp. iii+292. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1934. Paper, M. 9.

IN this volume Professor Schur develops the thesis outlined in Dr. Seel's little book on the *Suasoriae* (reviewed in C.R. 1931, p. 90), that Sallust was not a mere partisan of Caesar and the Populares, but an independent with a standpoint not unlike that of Cicero. From this starting-point he goes on to show that the emphasis on ethical regeneration and on the need of a 'praefectus morum' at Rome, which was the common characteristic of Sallust and of Cicero (in the *De Republica*), was derived from the Greek writers on Rome; and he singles out Posidonius as the chief formative influence on Sallust's thought. He concludes that, though Sallust never followed Posidonius nor any other source blindly, his pet theory of the Decline and Fall of the Republic through the *ambitio*, and, worse still, the *avaritia* of its leaders, was taken over in its main outlines from his Stoic predecessor. In the light of this general principle he analyses the extant historical writings of Sallust at considerable length and with unflinching ingenuity. He shows convincingly that Sallust wrote, not as a party enthusiast, but as a man who is disillusioned about all parties, and equally distrustful of military dictators.

In his analysis of the *Catiline* Professor Schur makes some debatable statements. He rightly insists that Sallust was not belittling Cicero or seriously attempting to shield Caesar. Yet he simply assumes that Caesar and Crassus were the arch-plotters, and is thus left to explain that Sallust magnified Catiline 'for artistic reasons.' He contends truly that Sallust had lost faith in Caesar, but he provokes dissent in representing Caesar's speech on the Nones of December as that of a Machiavellian Prince, and Cato's rejoinder as honest Utopianism.

In the chapters on the *Jugurtha* and the *Historiae* Professor Schur's methods are seen at their best, and we may generally agree with his estimates of the portraits in which Sallust exhibited Marius, Sertorius and Pompey. But he leaves unsolved the problem of Sallust's attitude to the Equites. Since the historian's principal *bête noire* was the plutocrat, this problem is a point of major interest.

Some may still hold that it is the artist, not the philosopher, that predominates in Sallust. But even so Professor Schur's work demands serious attention. It has carried the study of Sallust a considerable stage further.

M. CARY.

University of London.



## RESTORATIONS AND EMENDATIONS OF HORACE.

*Horati Carmina Viginti restituit emendavit* A. Y. CAMPBELL. Pp. viii + 52. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1934. Paper, 5s.

IN his preface Mr. Campbell claims that this little volume contains the fruits of his earlier Horatian studies which he published in 1924 under the title of *Horace: A New Interpretation*. There he elucidated Horace's principles of lyric composition—summed up, apparently, by *series iuncturaque pollet*: here he applies them to solve the critical difficulties of twenty selected Odes.<sup>1</sup>

Mr. Campbell regards his task as two-fold—to 'restore' and to 'emend.' By 'restoration' he seems to mean transposition and combination. His transpositions are not unattractive. Thus in I vi the first and fourth stanzas change places and in I xxiv the first and second: in each case he removes a serious awkwardness. His combinations of Odes<sup>2</sup> are less convincing because his reasons are so largely subjective. For example in I xxxiv (*Parvus deorum cultor*) the thunder-peal designates, in his view, the Civil Wars, and the shaking of Styx (though not, apparently, of the *Atlanteus finis*) results 'propter multitudinem affluentem occisorum'; and since the following Ode also alludes to the Civil Wars (33-38), the two are combined by a *callida iunctura*. Again, at the beginning of III iv Horace promises a *longum melos*; and although the poem is in fact the longest of the Odes, it is much shorter than Mr. Campbell's conflation of ii and iii which precedes it. Accordingly it is joined to Ode v.

To the second part of his task Mr. Campbell has addressed himself with vigour. In the Odes which he selects he has a contribution to make on almost every important textual problem (al though we miss a note on *alite* in I vi); and in view of the labours of a long succession of Horatian editors it is something of a feat to have produced a text

which wears so unfamiliar an aspect. A few of his emendations, it is true, he accepts from previous editors: thus we find Bentley's *strictis* for *sectis* I vi 18; Stephanus' *occupabit* for *occupavit* I xii 19; the anonymous emender's *di sic* for *quia* ib. 31; Baehrens' *pergulae* for *Apuliae* or *Pulliae* III iv 10; Canter's *trahenti* for *trahentis* III v 15; and several others. The majority however—he makes some thirty in all—are Mr. Campbell's own. Of these the following seem plausible although unnecessary:—*matrona*; *virgo* at for *matura virgo et* III vi 22; but *matura* gives a satisfactory sense and is paralleled by Verg. *Aen.* VII 53.—*reiectione* for *reiectaeque* III ix 20; but *Lydiae* is dative and the meaning is simply 'What if Chloe, the new mistress, is discarded in favour of the rejected Lydia?'—*Virque dum procedit* (referring to Augustus) in the *Io triumphae* passage IV ii 49 (45-48 and 49-52 are transposed and the genesis of the corruption is explained paleographically): but Pauly's *ter* seems a simpler and more effective correction. The remainder of his emendations are mostly rather strange, as may be gathered from the following selection:—I xii 35-37 *catenis* (Hamacher) *nobile nexum Regulum*. The MSS. give *letum*, *lectum*, *loetum*, *litum* and Mr. Campbell comments 'Varietas, opinor, indicat corruptionem'; but surely their agreement is more striking. *Nobile* is now adverbial, and for *nexum* (participle) he compares I xxix 4 *Medo nectis catenas*, failing to realize that this is no parallel. In any case the objections to *Catonis nobile letum* are not cogent.—I xx 10 *pices* for *bibes*: *picare* = *linere* and is found in Cato and Suetonius.—I xxxii 15 *fi bilinguis* for *cumque salve*. Does this mean anything at all?—I xxxv 17 *artat* for *anteit*, comparing Plaut. *Capt.* 304, where however Fortune is the subject of *artat*, not, as here, the object; and 24 *manicata* ('fettered') for *inimica*, although the word does not bear this sense elsewhere.—II i 20 *equitesque voluit* for *equitumque voltus*. Here his argument is: 'Terrere putem armorum fulgorem equitantum voltus? quam ergo terret equorum partem? num ungulas? oculos? nares? an nihil horum sed natibus quadrupedum

<sup>1</sup> I v, vi, xii, xx, xxiv, xxxii, xxxiv, II i, xx, III ii, iii, iv, viii, ix, x, xx, xxi, xxvi, IV ii, x. The numbering is Mr. Campbell's: according to the ordinary reckoning there are twenty-four.

<sup>2</sup> I xxxiv and xxxv; III ii and iii; III iv and v; II xv and III vi.

terrorem incutit? minime; ignaviora animalia terrentur tota. discrimen indignum et ridiculum."—III xx 8 *mater an illi*. This makes no sense: the meaning required is 'whether you or she will gain the prize.' Peerlkamp's *maior an illa* is dismissed as 'parum insulsum'!—III xxi 5 *quocunque fetum* (Bent.) *momine Massicum*. Here the note is: '*momen*, verbum Lucretianum, idem valet ac *momentum*; cf. 13 "*lene tormentum ingenio admoves*." quicquid movet debet

prius ipsum moveri; inde "*quocunque . . . momine . . . , moveri digna*."

Truly, Mr. Campbell leaves us sorely puzzled: but he recognizes our difficulties himself and asks us to suspend judgment, promising us a fuller explanation in the learned journals. Let us hope that he will then enlighten our darkness, for, on present evidence, few of his suggestions seem destined for a place in future editions.

T. E. WRIGHT.

*The Queen's College, Oxford.*

### A NEW TEUBNER TEXT OF TACITUS.

P. Cornelii Taciti libri qui supersunt. Recognovit C. HALM; post G. ANDRESEN denuo curavit E. KOESTERMANN. Tom. I, fasc. 1; libri ab excessu divi Augusti I-VI. Leipzig: Teubner, 1934. Cloth, RM. 2.20.

I. THE new editor has restored the following MS. readings for conjectures accepted by Andresen: I. 4 *exul egerit*; 8 *passus* without *est*; 26 *cur venisset neque*; 49 *cetera fors regit*. II. 31 *adpositum mensa*; *inducti sunt ut vincerentur*. III. 22 *velut reicere*; 26 *incidebat*; 29 *ultra*; and I. 28 *quae pergerent*. I agree with all these, except the last.

2. He prints *incipientes* (gen.) for *incipientes* in I. 19, and in II. 55, 3 and VI. 21 his own conjectures *cum <illum>* and *pavesces repente*.

3. For six conjectures accepted by A. he has substituted six others—all familiar except *<damno armorum>* [*vulneribus*] *quam . . . [damno armorum]* at II. 5; and has adopted Ernesti's *arguebatur* for *urgebatur* at VI. 29.

4. He has expelled the misprints, except Groslotius for *Groslotius*, p. 173; but he has let four new ones slip in—a misplaced comma (I. 34), I. for IV. (p. 155) and 38 for 33 (pp. 45, 197.) Iulli

*scripsi* at III. 18 should be *Iulli Andresen* (cf. I. 10; IV. 44, n. cr.).

5. He has increased the *apparatus*, chiefly by the addition of the important conjectures made in the last thirty years.

At I. 63 he mentions a conjecture that was rightly ignored by Andresen, viz. *legiones . . . reportat secl. Nipperdey*. N. supposed that *legiones* must include all eight legions, and not only the four commanded by Germanicus; and that this passage is inconsistent with c. 70. The passage was correctly explained by Dräger and there is no inconsistency. I do not think that Nipperdey was right in supposing that there are substantial interpolations in the MS. (II. 33; IV. 12). At VI. 23 he accepted Orelli's *miserandis alimentis [mandendo e cubili tomento]*. But is it likely that an interpolator inserted a remark from Suetonius? For the apposition to *alimentis* compare I. 44 *verbo uno . . . Quirites vocando*. And is Drusus 'chewing his mattress' further below the dignity of history than Latiaris and his comrades 'hiding between the roof and the ceiling and listening through the chinks'? E. C. MARCHANT.

*Lincoln College, Oxford.*

### THE SOURCES OF PLUTARCH'S LIVES.

N. I. BARBU: *Les procédés de la peinture des caractères et la vérité historique dans les biographies de Plutarque*. Pp. v+245. Paris: Nizet et Bastard, 1933. Paper.

THE title of this book conceals an inquiry into the sources of Plutarch's

Lives, based on a wide reading among these, rather than on an intensive study of a select few. Its main conclusions are as follows:

(1) The Hellenistic biographers dealt with intellectuals rather than politicians, and treated their subjects as pegs for

phil  
dote  
sequ  
muc  
hac  
fram  
little  
biog  
men  
goss  
Diog  
polit  
Live  
the v  
of th  
his r  
Gree  
(2)  
quai  
both  
his p  
citati  
indee  
'crib  
But  
—the  
comp  
the t  
death

EDUA  
ker  
suc  
pla  
II.  
Ber  
14  
'ETH  
griech  
prefac  
himse  
thing  
of the  
of the  
joined  
second  
logy a  
of a f  
book  
inter  
in sips  
Norde  
short  
NO.

philosophic observations or spicy anecdotes, not as historical agents. Consequently, though Plutarch derived much of his detail from this source, he had to go elsewhere for the general framework of his narrative.—It is a little perilous to judge the Hellenistic biographers by their remaining fragments, which are largely drawn from gossip-mongers like Athenaeus and Diogenes; and we can scarcely deny a political content to some of Hermippus' Lives (Solon and Lycurgus). Yet on the whole Dr. Barbu effectually disposes of the theory that Plutarch could find his material ready to hand in the later Greek biography.

(2) Plutarch had a first-hand acquaintance with the general historians, both classical and Hellenistic, and based his plan of the Lives on these. His citations from the general historians indeed prove little, for these might be 'cribbed' from an intermediate source. But the general content of the Lives—the wealth of military detail, the comparative paucity of scandal, and the total absence of highly coloured death-scenes—points to the use of a

historical main source.—Here we may go even further than Dr. Barbu. To his list of historians used directly by Plutarch we may add Aristotle, with whom his points of contact are especially numerous, and Philochorus (whom he almost certainly used, alongside of Aristotle, for his *Quaestiones Graecae*).

(3) Plutarch did not merely arrange his materials (like a Suetonius), but freely exercised his judgement upon them.—Here Dr. Barbu seems to make too large a claim. We may remark that Plutarch's arguments κατ' εἰκός may largely be derivative, for this method of proof was typical of Aristotle, and no doubt of other Peripatetics. But Dr. Barbu is surely right in contending that the appreciation and delineation of character is Plutarch's own contribution to the Lives. The same ἦθος pervades the Lives, and recurs in Plutarch's other writings; this at any rate is not derivative.

In this book there is perhaps less ingenuity than in other *Quellenforschungen*, but there is more broad common-sense.

M. CARY.

University of London.

#### TEPMANIKA.

EDUARD NORDEN: *Alt-Germanien, völker- und namengeschichtliche Untersuchungen*. Pp. xiv + 325; 6 folding plates. (Neue Wege zur Antike, II. Reihe, Heft 3.) Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1934. Paper, RM. 14 (bound, 16).

'ETHNOGRAPHISCHES denke ich gern griechisch,' explains the author in his preface, and indeed his Γερμανικά, as he himself there calls the work, have something of the spirit of antiquity and also of the leisurely, discursive antiquarianism of the humanists. When to this is joined a wide and by no means always second-hand acquaintance with archaeology and the ripe philological wisdom of a first-rate Latinist, the result is a book of modest pretensions and great interest, a work to linger over and read in sips rather than at a gulp. Formally, Norden merely asks what two or three short passages in Latin historians mean

and whence the name 'German' may be supposed to come. But this simple framework cannot be filled without a series of excursions, philological and archaeological, which take him and his readers over half Europe, yet never once to an unnecessary place. The length of the work is due to a desire to understand as fully as may be, and the extent of some of the notes arises from an honest attempt *suum cuique tribuere*, and to assign the credit for what is taught to the proper authors, classical, Renaissance or modern, from archaeologists of the calibre of von Duhn and MacIver to the most modest local antiquaries.

The first problem discussed is: what does Ammianus Marcellinus mean when he says (xviii, 2, 15), according to the only MS. authority, *cum uentum fuisset ad regionem, cui Capellatii uel Palas nomen est, ubi terminales lapides Romanorum et Burgundiorum confinia distinguebant*? The

form *Capillacii* and the reading *Alamanorum* for *Romanorum* are conjectures, one of Heraeus, the other, *Alamannorum*, or rather *Alemannorum*, for so he spelled it, of Gelenius. For the fact that there was a certain place beyond the Rhine where a regular boundary existed and was marked with *terminales lapides* in proper Roman fashion between Rome and a barbarian people, thus treated as an equal, Norden appeals to an imposing array of data, elicited from the all too scanty evidence at our disposal for the history of those troubled times, to show, firstly, that two German nations would not have had such a boundary, secondly, that the Burgundians, the occasional allies of Rome (in official panegyrics, her subjects), were in this respect the forerunners of many Germanic peoples who were later to apportion territories to themselves and to the Roman population. The place was not on the old, abandoned *limes* beyond the Rhine, but farther west than that. Hence it becomes doubtful whether Palas has anything to do with *palus*; why name a place after the stakes of a defensive work which was never there? The doubts become still graver when we look at the suffix, *-at-*, which is indeed good old Latin (as in *Arpinas*, etc.), but too old to be likely in a new name, while it remained good current Celtic after it had fossilized in Italy, although the quantity was different, short *a* and not long. As to the syllable *Pal-*, it has a wide range in place-names, whereof *Palatium* is the most famous, and possibly signifies a piece of rising ground. *Capellatii* again can hardly have anything to do with *capellare* (*concupilabo*, Plaut., *Truc.*, 621, besides late instances of the stem), for the meaning 'clearing,' 'path through forest' is ex-

cluded by the fact that it means to chop up small, not to cut down. Again we have a stem of unknown meaning, but to be found in some Gaulish names, and a suffix strongly suggesting the name of some unknown clan of, probably, Celtic speech, the *Capellatii*, whoever they may have been. This naturally leads to a discussion of that mysterious region, belonging to the same debatable land, the *decumates agri* of Tacitus, *Germ.*, 29. Celtic in suffix, with a stem identical with Irish *dechmad* (cf. *coiced*, the group of the five Irish provinces), *decumas* is no Latin word at all,—which explains why the adjective is placed where no Roman would put it; who ever says *Romanus ager*, for instance?—but a local name of this Celtic-speaking district, 'the place of the ten-fold', some ancient territorial division.

Being on the subject of boundaries, he pauses to interpret (pp. 191-213) a famous and mysterious boundary-mark, the so-called *Toutonenstein*, now at Miltenberg; its lettering, with a mistake in the final letter, is given in *C.I.L.*, xiii, 6610. It probably lay between the territories of the Teutones and Cimbri.

Finally, in the last hundred pages or so, he grapples with the long-disputed question why his own people are called in their own tongue *Deutsch* and by the Romans *Germani*. The ultimate result is that the former name, 'the folk,' and the latter, of unknown significance, have cognates over a wide area, whereof Illyricum is the nearest part to the regions under discussion. The glimpses of ethnographic and proto-historic riddles here are peculiarly intriguing.

H. J. ROSE.

*University of St. Andrews.*

#### THE ART OF LANGUAGE.

W. A. RUSSELL: *The development of the art of language as exhibited in Latin and in English*. Pp. 174. London: Williams and Norgate, 1933. Cloth, 7s. 6d.

THIS is not a book on *Stilistik*, as one would expect from the title, but an elementary exposition of historical syntax. The author claims to approach these

problems from a new standpoint, but I have been unable to discover anything that is both new and true. The remarks on syntax are interspersed with quotations from various modern psychologists, but it is often difficult to see their relevance. In fact the author sometimes seems guilty of a certain *ἐπίδειξις*. The following may serve as



typical specimens of his method. 'May has come to express contingency, e.g. "Power cannot change them but love may." From the idea of contingency there has developed in modern times the mathematical theory of Probability' (p. 65). In his explanation of the subjunctive in consecutive clauses the author writes (p. 107) that 'this was perhaps due to that attitude of mind still to be observed in people of rather primitive culture which attributes events to the working of a will in things.' On p. 108 the author is perplexed by the use of the subjunctive in indirect questions although it is obvious why it should be used in indirect commands. But can we always discover a logical reason for a syntactical usage? It may be that the subjunctive was originally used only in dependent deliberative questions and that its extension is due to formal reasons. Such purely formal extensions are surely a commonplace in historical syntax.

The book concludes, curiously enough, with a brief exposition of semantics. It is misleading to speak of Bréal's *laws* of change. They are actually nothing more than superficial categories without any reference to what is of real interest and importance in the history of word-meanings, namely the conditions and circumstances responsible for those changes. There are some questionable statements in the book. *Vivamus in vivamus, mea Lesbia* is translated as 'we will live' and classified as 'free volition.' *Qui, quae, quod* are 'evidently derived from *quis*'! (p. 93). Apart from these flaws there are numerous misprints in the Latin quotations. The book might possibly find use as an introduction to the principles of syntax, but young students would be deterred and perplexed by the wealth of psychological quotation. In any case the present index is useless.

L. R. PALMER.

University of Manchester.

#### A LATIN-FRENCH DICTIONARY.

FÉLIX GAFFIOT: *Dictionnaire Illustré Latin-Français*. Paris: Hachette, 1934. Pp. 1702+xviii; maps and illustrations. Cloth, 75 fr.

THIS work, which is intended to provide a Latin counterpart to the Greek dictionary of Bailly, covers the period from the Twelve Tables to the Digest, particular attention being paid to the authors from Plautus to Tacitus. In a lexicon of this size the reader is fairly entitled to expect a complete list of the words found in literary texts and inscriptions of the period, with a full account of their usages, characteristic contexts, and historical and logical development. This expectation is not entirely satisfied. A few instances must suffice. Of missing words perhaps *lureo* is the most important: it is read by Ellis in Verg. *Cul.* 221 and is possible in Plaut. *Men.* 828, Hor. *Epod.* XVII 33, Ov. *Met.* II 776; *inenarrabiliter* may be right in Liv. *XLI* 15; *alisequos* is virtually certain in Cat. *LXVI* 54; the superlative *occisissimus* of Pl. *Cas.* 694 deserves a place. Appearances of a word in Plautus are often ignored, e.g.

*admisceo* (Caes., Cic., Cat., Liv.) *Cas.* 222; *increbresco* (Cic., Liv.) *Merc.* 838, *pudicitia* (Cic., Sall., Liv.) *Epid.* 405, *sensim* (Cic., Phaedr.) *Cas.* 815. Sometimes Ciceronian references only are given where other authors should be cited; e.g. *amabilis* should have references to Pl., Lucr., Cat., Hor., Ov.; *immuto* to Pl., Ter.; *malitiose* (for *posit.* and *comp.*) to Pl. If a word appears in poetry as well as prose, references should be given for both; e.g. *delectus* should be illustrated by Pl., Verg., Ov. in addition to Caes., Cic., Tac. The use of *exsecror* by Vergil (the first appearances in verse) in *Aen.* III 273, *XI* 217 is not mentioned. It is pleasant to find many new examples from Livy, though here too there is room for fuller treatment, since important omissions are noticeable. Some articles would benefit from a little more detail, e.g. *captiosus*, *ora* (here *ora* 1 and *ora* 2 should be combined to form a single article), *pius*, *privatus*, *sanctus*, *stolidus*, and many proper names. Variations in spelling are not always given and sometimes there is a lack of co-ordination, e.g.



*tempto* but *adtempto*, *pertento*. The maps occasionally offer different spellings of the same place-name.

But for the unfortunate necessity of translating all cited examples, simple and difficult alike, there would have been space to remedy many of the faults that have been mentioned and the work would have had a greater value

for scholars. However, even in its present condition the dictionary represents the fruit of much careful labour and will be valuable to those readers who are satisfied with something short of completeness. The maps and illustrations are interesting and useful.

J. F. LOCKWOOD.

University College, London.

#### ERASMIANA.

*Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterdami, denuo recognitum et auctum per P. S. ALLEN et H. M. ALLEN.* Vol. VIII. *Compendium Vitae P. S. ALLEN addidit H. W. GARROD.* Pp. xlv + 516, with three plates. *Erasmus: Lectures and Wayfaring Sketches.* By P. S. ALLEN. Pp. xii + 216, with portrait of author. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1934. Cloth, 28s. and 12s. 6d.

PROFESSOR GARROD has written a delightful memoir of the late President of Corpus, and has assisted in the production of the eighth volume of his great work. He will also be associated with Mrs. Allen in its completion. The present volume takes Erasmus from Basle to Freiburg. He writes to More on his elevation to the Chancellorship, congratulating England rather than him. He dedicates the *Christian Widow* to Katharine of Aragon, and expounds a Psalm at the request of Anne Boleyn's father, expressing repeatedly his determination not to be mixed up with the affairs of the English king. He keeps up with his old patron Lord Mountjoy, and exchanges letters with Tunstall and Pace. Tunstall very strongly objects to his controversies with monks, and Sadoletto gives him the same advice in a more gentle form. But Erasmus' touchiness grew with age, and the detailed criticisms of the Franciscan Titelmus stung him to fury, just as much as the more vulgar attacks from Paris and Spain. However, by definitely breaking with the Reformers he had placed himself in complete safety, and might well have treated his adversaries with con-

tempt. Of his great undertakings, Augustine had been completed and Chrysostom was making good progress in 1530. No. 2283 is a letter to Hector Boece of Aberdeen, who had been a fellow-student at Paris 34 years earlier, and contains a list of his writings for which Boece had asked.

Dr. Allen, when urged to write a life of Erasmus, always replied that he must edit his letters first. Now Mrs. Allen has given us a collection of his lectures and sketches of travels, so that we have almost a complete life of Erasmus. Professor Bywater wrote once: 'I do not envy the man who can think evil of Erasmus, or speak lightly of his services to literature and learning.' Dr. Allen has given us a perfect picture of the indomitable perseverance in face of difficulties, quick wit, and intellectual sincerity of this pioneer of scholarship and reformer of theology. The new material in this collection consists of essays on Erasmus' *Liber de sarcienda ecclesiae concordia* with a large passage translated, 'Erasmus' Servant-pupils,' with a delightful quotation from Bishop Gardiner, and 'Trilingual Colleges of the early sixteenth century.' The eight 'Erasmian Wayfarings' are felicitous and masterly: perhaps 'A Castle in Spain' and 'Durham' may be singled out. No one else could have written them. One point is very clearly shown by the book, that Erasmus' visits to England and friendship with Colet inspired and assisted him to produce the Greek Testament and the Paraphrases.

G. C. RICHARDS.

Oxford.

J. R.  
brie  
THIS  
of the  
ject is  
straig  
'First  
strate  
name  
Greek  
gods.  
me th  
moder  
purpo  
he ha  
as wel  
may h  
canno  
chroni  
someo  
them,  
to the  
stood  
The r  
stand  
are co  
p. 45  
formul  
Orphic  
about  
may b  
strate  
The  
an ent  
to be  
It is p  
others  
'happ  
is chie  
mough  
lose th  
him at  
On  
edited

Pete

DANIE  
du ch  
aten  
1933  
40 fr  
THIS v  
firm an  
about t  
the Sy  
from t  
Schlum  
to whic  
isolated  
the pro  
which  
first cer  
much in  
fessed  
sceptic  
that a c  
Colonna  
ing, the

J. R. WATMOUGH: *Orphism*. Pp. 80. Cambridge: University Press, 1934. Cloth, 3s. 6d. THIS pleasantly written first essay is the winner of the Cromer Greek Prize for 1934. Its subject is not, as might be thought from the title, a straightforward description of Orphism itself. 'First,' says Mr. Watmough, 'I wish to demonstrate that the tradition associated with the name of Orpheus is no less characteristic of Greek thought than is the cult of the Olympian gods. Second, I wish to draw what seems to me the obvious analogy between Orphism and modern Protestantism.' In other words, his purpose is purely comparative, since obviously he has no space for an independent description as well. The intention is honestly stated, and may be thought to be legitimate. But one cannot help feeling sorry for the Orphics, whose chronic fate it has been to be compared with someone else. Much has been written about them, but little which gives its whole attention to them and seeks simply to find out what they stood for. Yet clearly this ought to come first. The result is that 'Orphic' and 'Orphism' stand throughout in inverted commas, and we are continually doubting. For example, on p. 45 we read of the 'absence of a logically formulated theology' as a characteristic of the Orphics. I had thought the most striking thing about them was its presence. Mr. Watmough may be right, but he does not seek to demonstrate it.

These remarks are ungenerous as applied to an entertaining essay which does not pretend to be an original work of classical scholarship. It is perhaps difficult to be open-minded when others have taken lightly what we ourselves happen to have chosen to take seriously. What is chiefly to be hoped is that when Mr. Watmough attacks a tougher problem he may never lose that happiness of touch which distinguishes him at present.

On p. 10 it is stated that Otto Kern has edited the Orphic Hymns. Would that he had!

W. K. C. GUTHRIE.

*Peterhouse, Cambridge.*

DANIEL SCHLUMBERGER: *Les formes anciennes du chapiteau corinthien en Syrie, en Palestine et en Arabie*. Pp. 35; 11 plates. (From *Syria*, 1933, pp. 283 ff.). Paris: Geuthner. Paper, 40 fr.

THIS valuable paper is designed partly to confirm and partly to correct those conclusions about the evolution of the Corinthian capital in the Syrian area which Weigand has drawn from the study of Baalbek and Palmyra. Schlumberger argues that the Baalbek capitals to which Weigand attaches such weight are an isolated Roman intrusion and that Antioch is the probable source of the 'normal' capital which swept the board by the middle of the first century A.D. The excellent plates illustrate much important new material. It must be confessed that at least one hypothesis gives the sceptic pause. Schlumberger maintains (p. 300) that a crucially important capital in the South Colonnade at Palmyra is the oldest in the building, though it admittedly rests on one of the

latest columns, and puts forward the suggestion that it served as a model to the carvers of the rest and was kept in the workshop till all the rest were in place.

D. S. ROBERTSON.

*Trinity College, Cambridge.*

FRITZ FISCHER: *Nereiden und Okeaniden in Hesiods Theogonie*. Pp. 157. Halle a. d. Saale: O. Jung. 1934. Paper.

PARTS of this monograph make the reader glance back at the title-page to make sure that it was printed in 1934 and not 1904 or 1894; it continually recurs to an extreme form of the theory of 'faded gods' which was once so popular, especially in Germany. Thus, Odysseus is another Poseidon (p. 89), Peleus a chthonian deity of some sort (p. 83), and of course Admetos is a death-god (p. 59 and often). Elsewhere, it displays a lack of insight into the difference between poetic fancy and real cult-myth which unhappily is not peculiar to any age or country. The general thesis is that the lists of nymphs in Hesiod are largely composed (a few are allowed to be Hesiod's own invention) of forgotten chthonian goddesses, driven into obscurity by the vigorous proselytizing of the Olympians' missionaries,—this idea is taken over from the author's teacher, Prof. Otto Kern,—but still to be identified for what they originally were. The arguments in favour of this hypothesis are such as to obscure the occasional elements of truth which it may possess. For instance, Kerkeis' name (*Theog.* 355) seems to be connected with *kerkis*; now Kalypso is represented as weaving; but Kalypso is a chthonian goddess; therefore Kerkeis is one also (p. 60); Hippo, Hippothoe, and several other 'horse'-names are evidently chthonian, because the horse is always a chthonian beast; and so forth. It is interesting to note that if anyone is said to have been *ἐαυθός* (p. 61) his association with the underworld is as good as proved. The regrettable thing is that a man evidently of some learning, who has been at considerable pains to collect his facts and often mentions interesting details of cult or myth, should interpret so very ill as to make his work extremely wearisome to read and obscure some points on which he is possibly or probably right.

H. J. ROSE.

*University of St. Andrews.*

WALTER STETTNER: *Die Seelenwanderung bei Griechen und Römern* (Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft, xxii. Heft). Pp. viii + 92. Stuttgart and Berlin: Kohlhammer, 1934. Paper, M. 5.40.

THIS is a useful sketch of the philosophic doctrine of reincarnation from the days of Pythagoras to the last struggles of Paganism. No attempt is made to include, what might have been legitimately added, the popular practices which have with more or less plausibility been taken to imply such a belief independent of philosophy. The author distinguishes two chief types, that according to which all souls are reincarnated in an endless cycle and that which allows of an escape from the *κύκλος γενέσεως* for the better and purer spirits. The former he

supposes Pythagorean, while the latter is to be found as early as Empedokles. Further, numerous sub-varieties are duly listed, for example the differing theories of late authors as to whether the soul of a man can pass into a beast or only into another human being. The order of the discussion is chronological, three periods being distinguished, (1) from Pythagoras onwards, when the doctrine was prominent and a live question of philosophy, (2) the earlier Hellenistic epoch, when no one seems to have believed it though everyone knew the Pythagoreans and others had done so, (3) the Imperial age, when the doctrine was once more accepted, in sundry varieties, influenced among other things by Stoicism, as an article of faith in Neoplatonic and similar circles, where the fact that Plato had believed it was argument enough.

On the whole, Stettner shows good critical sense as well as industry, and many passages indicate considerable insight (e.g., p. 28, on Pindar's attitude; p. 48, where, following Reinhardt, he refuses to fill all blanks in our tradition with the name of Poseidonios). A marked exception is, however, the discussion of Plutarch on pp. 59-61, where some strange misunderstandings of the plain meaning of the text vitiate his analysis. On p. 30 he is perhaps a little too sure that Plato's *Apology* represents what Socrates really said. A few other points which arouse the reviewer's disagreement or doubt are the following. P. 19, to say that Pythagoras was 'noch eng genug mit der Natur verwachsen, um ein Einheitliches in Mensch und Tier zu erkennen' confuses a savage's lack of analysis with a civilized man's synthesis. P. 27 discovers a difference between Pindar, fr. 133, and the second *Olympian* which is not really there. P. 43, there is no idea of reincarnation in Kallimachos, fr. 83 (*Iamboi* I Mair): the ghost of Hipponax rises in tragic style and speaks. P. 63, I can see no more reason for supposing the journeys of Apollonios of Tyana to be historical than for accepting any other of Philostratos' statements about him.

H. J. ROSE.

*University of St. Andrews.*

W. L. WESTERMANN and E. S. HASENOEHRL: *Zenon Papyri*, Vol. I. Pp. x+177; 8 facsimiles. (Columbia Papyri, Greek Series, Vol. III.) New York: Columbia University Press (London: Milford), 1934. Cloth, \$6.00 or 30s. A LANDMARK in the history of papyrology is the discovery in 1914 of the papers of Zenon, secretary and estate-manager of Apollonios, the all-powerful Vizier of Ptolemy II, and this volume is a first instalment of those now in Columbia University, the only large group beside that in London remaining unpublished. The level of interest is high, and hardly a page but provides some fresh and valuable information about Zenon and contemporary society. Among more notable documents are: 2, trading accounts of a camel caravan in Egypt and Palestine, with the earliest mention of Galilee in Greek (Γαλιλα). 4, an account of papyrus, vividly illustrates the activities of Apollonios's secretariat, 434 rolls

being consumed in 33 days. At the price of 4 obols a roll, the expenditure of 1066 dr. on papyrus in 5 must have purchased over 1800 rolls. 6 is an interesting appeal from the mother of a boy taken ill while serving as a page in the household of Apollonios. Three visitors to Egypt from Kaunos, and thus fellow-citizens of Zenon, are authors of 11, but their anxiety to produce a polished epistle has had a curiously stilted result. The importance of 14 has been missed by the editors: Apollonios writes of τὸ παραγεγεννημένον ἔλαιον ἐξ οἴκου, 'the oil arrived from home,' and as Zenon repeats the phrase in his docket it seems possible that Apollonios himself was a native of Kaunos; his Carian sympathies had already suggested to Edgar (P. Mich. Zen. p. 96) a Carian birthplace. 15 and 17 deal with the manufacture of sumptuous στρώματα for Zenon, 34 with the beer-brewing monopoly at Philadelphia. In 41 Phileas the ἐγλογιστής asks for the bearer to be accommodated with a loan, concluding φανερός δέ σοι ἔσται ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἀπὸ τῆς ἐσθῆτος ὃς ἔστιν; also in Hellenistic Egypt 'Clothes made the Man.'

The reading and interpretation of the documents are sometimes open to criticism, giving the impression that the editors are not really at home with Greek of this period, while the translations are not always as accurate as might be wished; printing of the Greek without accents or breathings can only be regretted. Taken all round, however, an attractive volume.

T. C. SKEAT.

T. Macci Plauti *Menaechmi*. Edited, with introduction and notes, by NICHOLAS MOSELEY, Ph.D., and MASON HAMMOND, B.Litt. Pp. vii+131. Cambridge, U.S.A.: Harvard University Press (London: Milford), 1933. Cloth, \$1.50 or 7s.

THIS edition is designed to meet the needs of the 'American College freshman.' In fourteen pages he will find a history of Greek Tragedy, Old, Middle and New Greek Comedy, and Roman drama from the earliest times to the Middle Ages. The pages which follow describe 'Stage and Production,' grammar, metre, etc., and will probably be very useful. The text is mainly based on the editions of Lindsay and Conrad; in ll. 31, 152-3, 592-3 it inclines to Conrad; in ll. 124, 188, 308, 803-4 to Lindsay. The scansion of each line is made clear by ictus marks, etc. The explanatory notes are at the front of the page, and there is an index. On the whole the notes are meagre and rather elementary, as when we are told that *uenit* at the end of a senarius (l. 29) must be present tense. More detail and in particular more examples to illustrate points of grammar would have been helpful. The few original remarks seem open to question; the interpretation of l. 3 *adporto uobis Plautum—lingua, non manu* 'i.e. the play will be presented on the stage and not as a book' presupposes a large reading public. The reviewer cannot, however, criticize the note on l. 59, having made a similar suggestion in C.K. XLIV (1930) 166. On the whole, we feel that this new edition does not

supersede that of Thoresby Jones for class use, at least in this country.  
W. BEARE.  
*University of Bristol.*

Josephus: *Jewish Antiquities*. Books V-VIII. With an English translation by the late H. St. J. THACKERAY and RALPH MARCUS. Pp. ix+811. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press), 1934. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).

EVERYONE must regret that the late Dr. Thackeray did not live to complete his translation of Josephus; but the work is being continued by loyal and capable hands. This volume, which runs from Joshua's invasion to the death of Ahab, does not in any way fall below the standard of excellence of its predecessors; the text and translation of books V and VI down to § 140 are Thackeray's, the rest those of Dr. Marcus, but I doubt if anyone could detect any difference in the translations, unless it be the absence of Thackeray's occasional conscientious literalisms. Like the first volume of the *Antiquities*, this one supplies a good and readable translation, with critical and valuable explanatory notes (perhaps a little fuller in Marcus' part), which give references to the A.V., LXX, and Jewish tradition, indicate Josephus' own additions, in these books mainly speeches and numbers (about the only point of interest is that the original balsam for the famous gardens of Jericho was brought by the Queen of Sheba), explain his forms of proper names, and give modern identifications of place-names. One trifle—'brass' for 'bronze' in V, 32—needed altering, but the only inadequacy I have noticed is the phrasing of p. 39, note h, 'of the real or supposed Scythian invasion which gave it (Beth-shan) its other name (Scythopolis) nothing is known'; the Saka invasion of the seventh century B.C. is real enough (Herod. I, 105; Strabo XI, 511-2; C. J. Gadd, *The Fall of Nineveh*; E. H. Minns in *C.A.H.* III, pp. 189-90), but so are the objections to connecting the Hellenistic name, whatever it means, with the seventh century. One statement of my own needs correction. In common with some others, I said in reviewing vol. IV that the Greek text was based on Niese's, Marcus' preface states that it is based on the apparatus in Niese's *editio major*.  
*Muirtown, Inverness.* W. W. TARN.

RAFFAELLO DEL RE: *Il dialogo Sull' Estinzione degli Oracoli di Plutarco da Cheronea*. Pp. 111. Naples: Morano, 1934. Paper, lire 8.

THIS is a very pleasing and readable monograph on an interesting and somewhat neglected work. So far as the author can discover, there is no separate treatment of the dialogue *de defectu oraculorum* other than his own, and it certainly deserved one. The work is divided into five sections, dealing in turn with the formal and literary aspects of the dialogue, the substance, and especially the doctrines set forth concerning the nature of daemons and their relation to oracles in general; the theories

concerning the universe, and in particular the curious doctrine of the five universes which fills a long episode in Plutarch's work; the excellent stories, including the famous death of Pan, which diversify it (after the fashion of Herakleides of Pontos, as the author omits to add); and, finally, the influence of the dialogue on later literature and thought. Of these sections, the first two are the most important. The question which is most interesting is naturally the extent, if any, to which what Plutarch writes can be considered original, and del Re is very sensible on this point. Without claiming for the sage of Chaironeia the status of a great pioneer of philosophy, he justly insists that he was not a mere compiler, a more literary Stobaios or Aetios, but a scholarly and thoughtful man who handled his abundant reading critically, making his own by assimilation and combination doctrines which owed their origin to more original minds and never accepting anything purely on the authority of a great name. In support of this, he cites (p. 53) instances of the tendency of Plutarch to harmonize divergent views into a unity of his own; he notes (p. 70) his attitude of moderate and reasonable skepticism, and also (p. 93) the occasional polemical tone, quite inconsistent with a passive acceptance of others' thought.

The reviewer has noted a number of misprints, but no mistake of the author worth recording.  
H. J. ROSE.

*University of St. Andrews.*

N. I. BARBU: *Les sources et l'originalité d'Appien dans le deuxième livre des Guerres Civiles*. Pp. iv+93. Paris: Nizet et Bastard, 1933.

IN this volume Dr. Barbu makes a running comparison between Appian and all the collateral authors in regard to the chief political events of the period 65-44 B.C., as a means of throwing light on Appian's sources. The chief clue which this method provides is to show up Appian's inconsistency in regard to Caesar, to whom he is usually more favourable, but sometimes more hostile, than the other writers. Dr. Barbu infers that Appian used three successive sources, and bore no close relation to Pollio (who dealt far more gently with the tyrannicides).

It is to be hoped that Dr. Barbu will proceed to apply his method to the remaining books of the Civil Wars. His present conclusion is merely provisional.  
M. CARY.

*University of London.*

M. ROSTOVITZEFF: *Città Carovaniere*. Pp. xvi+218; 37 plates, 6 illustrations in text, and 5 plans. Bari: Laterza, 1934. Paper, L. 25.

THIS is a translation of *Caravan Cities*, already reviewed in this review (xlvii p. 129). Two new plates are added, one giving the reconstruction of the Christian chapel discovered at Doura, and the other two panels from the Jewish synagogue there; the text on p. 174 directs the reader to the publication of the chapel in the fifth Report on the excavations at



Doura. The bibliography has been brought up to date.  
W. W. TARN.  
Inverness.

*Plato's Academy, or the Birth of the Idea of its Rediscovery.* By PAN. ARISTOPHRON. Pp. x+86. London: Milford, 1934. Cloth, 5s. THIS booklet, written both in Modern Greek and in English, explains the author's reasons for his attempt to discover and excavate the Academy. A talk on Science and Religion many years ago with an old and learned friend, who advised him to study Plato, led him to the belief that from the advance of the science of the human mind will emerge Something which will idealize and beautify the life of man. This was strengthened, three days before the War, by a vision of Plato standing by the Holy Sepulchre. The horrors of the War gave fresh impetus to his feelings which the inspiration of Raphael's frescoes on a visit to the Vatican still further confirmed. Thus with his wife he formed the desire to excavate Plato's Academy in the hope that it, with the new facts which excavation would reveal, might come to be the rallying-ground for participation in the world of ideas and the common bond of all man's forces scientific and spiritual irrespective of race and creed for the general benefit and re-creation of humanity. With these aims, which are expressed more fully on pp. 76-79, he at last in 1929 applied for permission to begin the excavations the results of which are well known. The booklet is well designed and printed, but on p. 60 ΣΤΕΤΝΗ is a slip for ΣΤΕΓΗΝ.

A. J. B. WACE.  
Cambridge.

*Charisteria Gustavo Przychocki a discipulis oblata.* Pp. xvi+363. Warsaw: Gebethner and Wolff, 1934. 7s. 5d. EIGHT of the nineteen contributions are in Polish, and of these the reviewer can form no estimate. Of the rest, four are in French, one in Italian, one in German, and five in Latin. The most interesting are perhaps T. Zielinski's witty and subtle discussion of the sources of the twelfth chapter of the Apocalypse, and W. Gordziejew's account of the origin and organization of the circus factions at Rome. A. Turyn contributes a useful supplement to his treatise on Pindar's MSS. Others deal with the influence of Plautus on lyric drama since the Renaissance (G. Pianko), the character and works of Critias (M. Maykowska), *ἠρώδης* and *πολύρος* in the *Nicomachean Ethics* (J. Siwecki), problems connected with Varro (L. Strzelecki), the word *τελετή* (F. Sokolowski), the satirical side of St. Jerome (S. Seliga), and 'iambic abridgment' in Latin (C. Régamey). G. Manteuffel publishes some papyrus scraps at Warsaw (*Cyropaedia* and a mime) and suggests the readings *ἔπειτα* and *κατέπαθον* in Menander's *Citharistria* 57 f., in place of *ἔπειτα* and *κατὰ λόγον*. The volume contains a portrait and a list of Przychocki's publications.

D. S. ROBERTSON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

W. H. ALEXANDER: *Notes and Emendations to the XII Dialogues of L. Annaeus Seneca.* Pp. 33. Edmonton: The University of Alberta Press, 1934. Paper.

It is a curious fact that the prose writings of Seneca, much as he was appreciated by the Church, have been so badly preserved. Professor Alexander has been studying the text for some time. He is well acquainted with the work of his predecessors, and the suggestions he makes on the text of some eighty passages in this pamphlet are worthy of careful attention. He may not have found out the true text in all places, but in one place at least he has, in my opinion, succeeded in doing so: *Dial.* 6, 3, 3, where he reads: *ipsunquē desiderans triste matribus omen occurrere* (placing a comma before *ipsunquē*).

A. SOUTER.

University of Aberdeen.

MAX WELLMANN: *Marcellus von Side als Arzt und die Koiraniden des Hermes Trismegistos.* Pp. 50. (Philologus, Supplementband xxvii, Heft 2.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1934. Paper, M. 4.50.

BY the sudden death of Max Wellmann a curious and little-known branch of learning lost a very able exponent. He had taken for his speciality the passage from scientific medicine to that mixture of second-hand empiricism and sheer magic which was to impose upon the world for centuries; a movement partly religious, partly scientific, which began somewhere about 200 B.C. with the activities of Bolos Demokritos. On this fascinating topic he had written one valuable work, *Der Physiologus*, reviewed in this journal, Vol. xlv, p. 45, by Principal Halliday. He left, in proof, the present well-reasoned monograph.

Marcellus of Side was in his day a *περίκλυτος ἰατρίης*, if we may believe the author of *A.P.*, vii, 158, 1, and still an authority to quote along with great names in the time of St. Jerome (*aduers.* *loui.*, ii, 6, Vol. ii, p. 332 B Vallarsius). To-day, of his two and-forty books in hexameters, dealing with *materia medica*, there survive 101 lines and some references. The Koiranides or Kyranides is two works thrown together into one, whereof the first, the Kyranis proper, is a single book, apparently of Eastern origin, prefixed by some Byzantine to three more books of Hermetic medical lore, dealing with the parts of animals which have virtue against diseases. It still awaits anything like adequate editing, which it deserves for the interest of its contents. The ostensible object of this essay is to determine the relation between the Hermetic treatise and Marcellus: the result is, that Marcellus used the prose work as material for his verses, which he well might do, for it seems to have been written before 70 A.D., while the physician-poet lived under Hadrian and Antoninus Pius. But in determining this, Wellmann touches on a great number of points interesting to philologists, folklorists and students of the rise and fall of medicine, and illuminates them all by his learning and good judgement.

University of St. Andrews. H. J. ROSE.



Q. S. Fl. Tertulliani *De Testimonio Animae* cum praefatione, translatione, adnotationibus . . . door W. A. J. C. SCHOLTE. Pp. viii+xii+138. Amsterdam: Vermeulen, 1934.

THIS edition of one of Tertullian's shortest treatises deserves commendation. It is in no way one-sided. For the editor has not only taken trouble about the constitution of the text and the interpretation of the Latinity, but his notes on the subject-matter, particularly his references to Greek writers, are most welcome. The Dutch translation, which is printed opposite the original, a foreigner will not of course attempt to criticize.

In the text it is offensive to find spellings like *coelo* and *loquela*, which Tertullian can never have used. In 4 § 10 it is not explained why *hodie* is bracketed, and in one or two other places the Dutch propensity to bracket the unintelligible is evident. I am sorry the editor did not have the courage to print Wilamowitz's emendation *fideiussorem* (6 § 1), even though the manuscript tradition is defensible. There are misprints on pp. 4 and 20.

*Receptissimus* (p. 35) might have been illustrated also from Gregory of Elvira (Ps.-Origen) tract 9 (p. 96, 19) etc.; *deus bonus* (pp. 60 f.), cf. *Apol.* 17; *Aphrodisiensis*, not *Aphrodisiatis* (p. 61), is the proper adjective. There are misprints on pp. 72, 82, 112.

A. SOUTER.

University of Aberdeen.

*The Excerpta ex Theodoto* of Clement of Alexandria, edited with Translation, Introduction and Notes by ROBERT PIERCE CASEY, Ph.D. Pp. viii+164. London: Christophers, 1934. Price 17s. 6d. (or by subscription.)

CLEMENT of Alexandria is of all the Greek Fathers the most important for the classical student, as he quotes hundreds of non-Christian authors. His works have been well edited by Stählin. But this fact by no means renders superfluous the excellent work of Professor Casey, now of Brown University, Providence, R.I., whom we may claim as one of ourselves, as he once studied at Jesus College, Cambridge. It is enough to mention his admirable work on Athanasius, to show that he is one of the soundest patristic scholars of our time. His edition of this note-book, for that is what it is, of Clement is an admirable piece of work from every point of view. As the title indicates, it is of a most comprehensive character. Casey's critical apparatus is something of a novelty, comprising as it does 'accepted emendations' and 'rejected emendations.' He has made an independent study of the Florentine manuscript. The introduction and notes contain everything one needs to know about the subject matter, and the whole work is attractively printed on good paper. It ought to be mentioned that it is the first volume of a new series called 'Studies and Documents,' edited by Professor and Mrs. Lake, which promises to be of the utmost value to students of the Bible and the Fathers.

A. SOUTER.

University of Aberdeen.

I. Firmici Materni *Consultationes Zacchaei et Apollonii* ad normam codicum recognitas adiectis adnotationibus criticis et indicibus edidit GERMANUS MORIN, O.S.B. Pp. 134. Bonn: Hanstein, '1935' (Nov. 1934). Paper, RM. 5.80.

CLASSICAL scholars are familiar with the *Mathesis* of Firmicus Maternus, perhaps also with his *De Errore Profanarum Religionum*. But until 1916 no one dreamt that a third work of this mid-fourth-century author also existed. In that year Dom Morin published a long article in *Historisches Jahrbuch* in which he argued forcibly that the *Consultationes Zacchaei et Apollonii*, then of unknown parentage, must also be assigned to Firmicus. His conclusion has not been seriously disputed, and now he has favoured us with a full-dress edition, which supersedes all previous editions in every respect. While the work is mainly interesting to the student of Christian dogma, it must not be neglected by anyone who cares at all for the history of the Latin Bible. Not all the biblical quotations in it are taken from Cyprian's biblical extracts addressed to Quirinus, and it is those that do not come from that source that demand special study. By this publication the veteran scholar has added one more to his innumerable services to the study of later Latin.

University of Aberdeen.

A. SOUTER.

B. H. SKAHILL: *The Syntax of the Variae of Cassiodorus*. Pp. xxiii+271. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America, 1934. Paper.

THE present piece of work, third volume of the 'Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Latin of The Catholic University of America', is creditable to the author and of considerable interest to students of the later Latin. And this is so, in spite of the fact that he does not know that another work was restored to Cassiodorus in 1906, namely the Commentary on The Epistle to the Romans, published under the name of Primasius in 1537, and reprinted in Migne's *Patrologia Latina*, vol. lxxviii, and in spite also of the inexperience shown in the rather naive remark that 'it is hoped that . . . the present monograph will be of value . . . particularly to future editors of those works of Cassiodorus for which as yet we have no modern critical texts.' The plan of the work is on the lines usual in the Catholic University, and it was certainly a good idea to begin such investigations with the *Variae*, so well edited by Mommsen (and Traube). The use of *quam= magis* (potius) quam (p. 65) occurs also in Scripture. It would have been interesting to be told whether the following words or phrases are really absent from Cassiodorus' *Variae*: *ad plenum* (p. 94), *citra* (= without), the *ad invicem* type (p. 136) *hortari* (p. 157); *in absoluto est* (p. 142) should have been quoted from Ambrosiaster; the use of *ex* referred to on pp. 121-2 was dealt with in *Raccolta di Scritti in Onore di Felice Ramorino* (Milan, 1927) pp. 275 f., and will be further illustrated in a forthcoming article in *Hermathena*. There is a misprint on p. 17.

A. SOUTER.

University of Aberdeen.

*Novum Testamentum Domini Nostri Iesu Christi* latine secundum ed. S. Hieronymi ad codicum fidem recensuerunt I. WORDSWORTH et H. I. WHITE. Partis II fasc. IV. Epistula ad Galatas, Ep. ad Ephesios: recensuit H. I. W. Pp. 355 to 454. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1934. Paper, 10s. 6d.

AT this time of day the character of the Oxford Vulgate is well enough known, but it is greatly to be regretted that this is the last part that we shall have from the hands of Dr. H. J. White, whose death last July is a serious loss to biblical studies. He had hoped, if life were continued to him, to finish the work in 1936. All the materials necessary had been assembled by him, and are now in the Christ Church Library. If only a competent successor can be found, the work ought to be brought to a happy end.

Jerome is the most 'classical' of all the Latin Christian Fathers, and classical scholars have much to learn from any work of his that is well edited. If only for the large amount of valuable data on Latin orthography which the Dean's work contains, this book ought to be possessed and used by all interested in that subject. Take, for example, the word *sterilis*, which oftener than not is spelt *sterelis* in older Latin manuscripts, though the latter form is not even mentioned in Georges' *Lexikon der lateinischen Wortformen* or in Brambach's *Hülfsbüchlein*. In the note on *Gal. 4. 27* we find that twelve out of twenty-one MSS spell it in that way. A. SOUTER.

University of Aberdeen.

Epiphanius *De Gemmis*; the Old Georgian Version and the Fragments of the Armenian Version by ROBERT P. BLAKE, Ph.D., and the Copto-Sahidic Fragments by HENRI DE VIS. Pp. cxxiv+388. London: Christophers, 1934. Paper, 40s. (or by subscription).

THIS is the second volume of the new series, 'Studies and Documents, edited by Kirsopp Lake and Silva Lake,' which promises to be of the utmost importance. The present edition of Epiphanius *De Gemmis* is in fact an *editio princeps*. Hitherto only a truncated Latin version has been known. The Old Georgian is a translation of an Armenian version of which only part survives. The Armenian version is itself a rendering of a Syriac version of which fragments are extant. Professor Blake's pre-eminence in all matters relating to Georgian is universally acknowledged, and by his other works he has already opened up a whole new field to the biblical and patristic student. The Georgian text of Epiphanius was copied by him from a tenth-century manuscript at Tiflis, and afterwards revised with the original. The technical difficulties to be overcome in printing the Georgian text were very great, but have been successfully surmounted. The copious introduction deals thoroughly with every topic of interest suggested by the treatise. The twelve gems discussed by Epiphanius are in fact those on Aaron's robe. It should be mentioned that the edition contains complete English translations of the Georgian, Armenian and Coptic versions, so that it can be used by those

who, like the present reviewer, are ignorant of these languages. If I mistake not, the work has interest even for the modern lapidary. All who have taken part in its publication deserve hearty congratulations. A. SOUTER.

University of Aberdeen.

SAMUEL CAVALLIN: *Literarhistorische und textkritische Studien zur Vita S. Caesarii Arelatensis*. Pp. x+136. Lund: Gleerup, 1934. Paper.

CAVALLIN, a pupil of Löfstedt, has been well inspired in turning his attention to one of the most interesting of the early ecclesiastical biographies. Caesarius of Arles was one of the greatest preachers of the Latin Church, whose sermons contain much material of importance bearing on the beliefs and morals of south Gaul about the end of the fifth century. His biography is interesting not only from the point of view of subject matter, but also from that of Latinity. A statement of Professor J. E. B. Mayor's (*Latin Heptateuch*, p. xi) led the present reviewer to study it from the latter point of view, and to publish the chief results of this study in the *Archiv für lat. Lexikographie*, vol. XL, pp. 129 ff. The best edition, that of Krusch in the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, appeared about the same time as this study was undertaken. Cavallin has studied Krusch very thoroughly, and has been able to improve his text in a number of passages. He has also dealt at great length with accident and syntactical matters, and has produced a most helpful and well-indexed book for students of the late period. A. SOUTER.

University of Aberdeen.

SISTER MARIA WALBURG FANNING: *Maphei Vegii Laudensis De Educatione Librorum et eorum Claris Moribus Libri Sex*. A Critical Text of Books I-III. Pp. xxvi+127. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America, 1933. Paper.

THIS book forms the first part of a new series, parallel to the well-known 'Patristic Studies' of the same university, entitled 'Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Latin.' The work of Mapheus Vegius, an Italian Christian humanist of the fifteenth century, marks an important stage in the history of pedagogical literature, and is the production of a man of real learning who uses the writings of his predecessors, both pagan and Christian, and even quotes one or two still extant Latin inscriptions. It was first printed in 1491, and fairly often reprinted down to the Tournai edition of 1854. The value of the present edition lies in the fact that the editor has collated nine MSS, as well as the *editio princeps*, in order to construct her text. The book is of great interest both to educationists and to all who are interested in the history of the use of ancient Greek and Latin writings. We are promised a similar edition of the remaining three books. The present volume is prefaced by an interesting account of Vegius' life and works, the manuscripts, printed editions, translations (French, German and Italian), as well as a bibliography of the chief works consulted in the preparation

of this edition. This work would have rejoiced the heart of the late Professor W. P. Mustard of Johns Hopkins. For the benefit of the uninitiated, it might have been well to add (p. xi) that the Ashmole collection is in the Bodleian.

The sources are not always indicated, e.g. in II 20 the passage of Gregory of Nazianzus is *Apol.* 48, as translated by Rufinus.

A. SOUTER.

University of Aberdeen.

R. H. BARROW: *A Selection of Latin Inscriptions*. Pp. viii + 91; 1 plate. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1934. Boards, 5s.

THIS compact and handy little volume will be of the greatest service to students and teachers, as a companion to such a text-book as Wells and Barrow's *Short History of the Roman Empire*—or, indeed, to much more advanced studies: it is simple enough for the beginner, and substantial enough for the specialist. It contains 160 inscriptions of the first two centuries of the Empire: all but a dozen or so are to be found in Dessau—the dozen including Tiberius's letter to the city of Gytheum about the imperial cult, which is just the kind of document to correct a student's impressions of an Emperor's character. This is one of the only three Greek texts printed, and their presence makes one wish—ungracious though it be to wish for more when so much is given, and so admirably—that room could have been found for some part of the Cyrene edicts (which are not easily accessible); but perhaps the editor felt that in printing the whole of the *Res Gestae* (with the Antiochene readings) and part of the *Acta Ludorum Saecularium* (where, incidentally, the reading from Severus's *Acta*—*utique semper Latinus obtemperassit* for Mommsen's *utique semper Latinum nomen tueamini*—might have been noted), he had given Augustus all the space he could afford. Other very welcome items are the Philae inscription of Cornelius Gallus, the Pisae resolution on the death of C. Caesar (showing how the dynastic succession was fully accepted by Italian public opinion, whatever senatorial constitutionalists might think), and the rules of the Lanuvium guild of Diana and Antinous. The notes are models of relevance, economy and clarity, and the tables of Tribunician Years and suchlike will be most useful.

A. F. GILES.

University of Edinburgh.

JACK LINDSAY: *I am a Roman*. Pp. 256. *Medieval Latin Poets*. Pp. 276. London: Elkin Mathews and Marrot, 1934. Cloth, 7s. 6d. each.

IN the first of the two volumes under review, Mr. Jack Lindsay has attempted to provide for the benefit of those who, as the late Professor Gwatkin used to say, are but mean scholars, a series of translations the aim of which is to show the Roman character in its strength and in its weakness; in what Mr. Lindsay happily calls its achievement of 'dedicated administrative

virtue,' and 'in the vulgarity or vice into which it could on occasion sink.

The material is well chosen, and although it is mainly derived from writers of the last century B.C. and the first century A.D., Mr. Lindsay does not leave out Rutilius, or Boethius, or even Sidonius; he quotes the famous economic edict of Diocletian and follows it with Marcus Aurelius's self-drawn portrait of the 'harassed Prince'; there are odes of Horace and epigrams of Martial, episodes from Petronius and Apuleius, and scribbles from the walls of Pompeii. Mr. Lindsay is a vigorous and straightforward translator, who does not beat about the bush. His method certainly has its advantages, but it is perhaps less happy when it is a question of the delicate beauty of Catullus.

In the second volume, Mr. Lindsay provides a 'Book of Medieval Latin Verse' in English, which could well be used as a companion to Mr. Gaselee's admirable volume by those who need an aid to the comprehension of the original texts. I cannot help wishing that Mr. Lindsay had, on some occasions, made a wider choice. No English poet has yet attempted Hildebert's two famous elegies on Rome, and Mr. Lindsay's undoubted success with Columba's powerful and gloomy *Allus proiator* suggests that he would have given us a fine rendering of Hildebert's *Alpha et Omega magne deus*. But the selection of secular verse is excellent, though the Ripoll poems seem to be unknown to Mr. Lindsay.

It is not necessary to go into small points of criticism in this short notice, but (p. 109) Peter Damiani is not the author of *Quis est hic qui pulsat ad ostium*, and (p. 191)

*Cum, in orbem universum, decantatur, ile* is not adequately rendered

The Word went forth: Arise, my lads,  
And prate to every nation,

because the force of the quotation from the Gospel is entirely lost.

But, altogether, the volume is very attractive and is one more welcome sign of the growing interest taken in medieval Latin literature.

F. J. E. RABY.

C. BRAKMAN: *Miscella Quarta*. Pp. iv + 48. Leiden: Brill, 1934. Paper, 1 fl.

THIS miscellany opens with an essay on the identity of Hegesippus, the historian of the Jews, which contains cogent criticisms of the existing theories, and suggests as the author a converted Oriental writing about A.D. 390. The rest of the volume contains notes, mainly critical, on Symmachus, Dracontius, the *Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum Epicorum et Lyricorum*, and the Latin Anthology. These are not of a high order. Though Dr. Brakman has much knowledge of palaeography, he possesses in this work neither the clear judgement that reliable emendation requires, nor the prudence to leave well alone. The MSS. of Symmachus show frequent lacunae, the probable content of which Seck gives in his footnotes, with a cautious *vel simile quid*. Dr. Brakman often criticizes his suggestions as

though they were intended to be readings, and confidently advances restorations that are mediocre in quality, or pure guesswork. He treats Dracontius' text in similar fashion, and indulges in the fruitless exercise of accumulating alternative emendations. Many of the *Fragmenta Poetarum* are part-line quotations, in completing which Dr. Brakman ventures on the treacherous sea of conjecture for no good purpose. Nor is he always consistent in his arguments, or capable of appraising the validity of evidence. An emendation introducing a common word is unaffected by the recurrence of the word elsewhere in the work, much less in another poem of a series such as the *Anthology*. Dr. Brakman's work is not without merit, but one cannot place unhesitating confidence in the guidance of one whose own Latin contains such errors as these: *quos ad unum omnes consentiunt* (for *qui*), p. 2; *clausulis Ciceronianis adhibet* (= *utitur*), p. 2; *quod factum tota castra cognovit* (for *cognoverunt*), p. 3; *se contendisse* (for *contulisse*), p. 5; *ardere for incendere*, p. 7; *utitur* with an accusative, p. 29.

W. S. MAGUINNESS.

*University of Sheffield.*

Right Hon. L. S. AMERY, M.P.: *The Stranger of the 'Ulysses'*. Pp. 163. London: Jarrolds, 1934. Cloth, 5s.

MEMBERS of Parliament who could appreciate a Latin quotation, or even recognize it as Latin, are a dwindling company, but there are still those among whom Canning would feel at home. Mr Amery is in the great succession. The 'stranger' of the title essay in this collection is Odysseus himself, who appears in the smoking-room of a liner ploughing her way through the Southern seas, listens to an Australian professor summarizing Leaf's *Troj*, and answers: 'Yes, I believe there is something in what you say—but you never saw Helen.' Mr Amery's characters throb with the life of the ancient world. Herodotus is reincarnated in the grandson of a Greek schoolmaster of Budrum (educated at Eton, Heidelberg, the Sorbonne and, of course, Balliol) who is discovered examining the walls of Zimbabwe for a chapter in his History of the Great War: 'it is all part of the history of the English in Africa. . . Cecil Rhodes was greatly interested in Zimbabwe.' Hannibal and Napoleon criticize the strategy of the Great War at the head of an Alpine pass; Caesar, Horace, Virgil and Pitt lunch together at the Sabine Farm and discuss the British Empire; Nausicaa was really an Ithacan maid who helped Homer with the *Odyssey*; a torpedoed British officer is carried on an upturned keel to the island of Calypso (Miss Aspasia Atlandopoulo) and stays there till a love that is immortal gets on his nerves. And so on. A whimsical fancy plays round the an ique furnishing of a very modern mind, and delights the reader from cover to cover.

W. M. CALDER.

*University of Edinburgh.*

- (1) H. VROOM: *Le psaume abécédaire de saint Augustin et la poésie latine rythmique*. Pp. 66. Nijmegen: Dekker, 1933. (2) (a) L. NICCOLINI: *Ruris desiderium*; (b) L. LUCSOLE: *Eucharisticon*. (3) (a) A. TRAZZI: *Ruris facies vespere*; (b) G. MAZZA: *Caelestia*; (c) L. NICCOLINI: *Pietas*; (d) G. B. PIGHI: *Epistula ad Murrium Keatinum*. (4) H. WELLER: *Prometheus*. Amsterdam: Academia Regia Discipularum Nederlandica, 1932-3-4. (5) T. H. S. WYLLIE: Goethe's *Faust*, 'Prologue in Heaven.' (6) A. F. WELLS: *Boswell's Life of Johnson*, Everyman's Edition, Vol. i, pp. 272-275. (7) W. S. BARRETT: Congreve's *Mourning Bride*, Act II, Scene iii—Scene vii, l. 38. (8) A. T. G. HOLMEN: *Flectere si nequeo*. . . (Gaisford Prize Poems.) Oxford: Blackwell, 1933-4. 2s. 6d., 2s. 6d., 2s. 6d., 2s. (9) P. R. BRINTON: *The Hunting of the Snark*, pp. 58. London: Macmillan, 1933. 2s. 6d.

(1) DR. VROOM rightly explains St. Augustine's innovation by his own words in the *Ketractationes*: *Volens etiam causam Donatistarum ad ipsius humillimi vulgi et omnino imperitorum atque idiotarum notitiam pervenire*. . . Attempts had been made to write hexameters accentually, but they were not very successful (so they have not been in English, though in German they are well enough), and therefore St. Augustine applied the principle to the more popular trochaic measure: and such was his success in it that he may be considered 'à cause de la technique de ses vers et de la négligence voulue et absolue du principe quantitatif, comme le père de la poésie rythmique.' I suspect Dr. Vroom's ear when he admits Engelbrecht's *Paulus* after the word *apostolus* in v. 270: the line seems to be perfectly satisfactory without it—

jussit mé apostolús pro régibús mundi oráre :  
he has himself shown (p. 20) that the writer employed hiatus whenever he found it convenient.

(2)-(4). These are 'Carmina Hoeufftiana': Signor Trazzi's poem is 'praemio aureo ornatum' the rest are 'magna laude ornata' or simply 'laudata.' Most of the writers are Italian, though Herr Weller comes from Tübingen: Fr. Luis Lucsole, *sacerdos poeta*, is doubtless of Italian descent, though himself an Argentine; he writes a pleasant send-off to a friend leaving to attend the Eucharistic Congress at Carthage. None of the poems are inspired, but I confess to a liking for Signor Mazza's glyconic *Caelestia*.

(5) Mr. Wyllie shows considerable metrical ingenuity, passing from short anapaests through a fairly simple logaedic measure to the long anapaestic line of the parabasis, and ending with comic, and I might say Aristophanic, iambs: he well deserved the (Oxford) Gaisford Prize for Greek Verse in 1933.

I can also commend Mr. Wells's Lucianic prose (6) and Mr. Barrett's (7) iambs, but doubt if the latter quite rises to the occasion. Congreve was not a poet of deep and passionate emotion, but at least he had worked himself up at the end of this passage to something really emotional—



'To fold thee thus, to press thy balmy Lips,  
And gaze upon thy Eyes, is so much Joy'

—and I doubt whether Mr. Barrett has really got there with

ἀλλ' ὡς περιπτύσσω σε καὶ φιλημάτων  
πίπλημι τέρψεαι σαῖσι τ' ἐμβλέπω κόραις . . .

Mr. Holmes deplores well enough (8) in a style between that of long Horace and Juvenal the traffic problem in Oxford. Mr. Brinton's (9) version of the *Snark* (perhaps Latin hexa-

meters were not the right medium) is not sufficiently pointed at the critical passages—such as 'Fry me, or Fritter my wig,' 'Transportation for life . . . And then to be fined forty pound,' and the climax of all 'For the Snark was a Boojum, you see.' But I must admit some admiration for the rendering of the famous line 'Then the bowsprit got mixed with the rudder sometimes'—it seems easy, but others might have been forced to a couplet for it—*Commixtam proramque gubernaculumque videres.*

S. GASELEE.

## CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editors of the CLASSICAL REVIEW.

DEAR SIRS,

In the review of *The Prae-Italic Dialects* which you published in C. R. xlviii, 1934, pp. 183 f. there are some errors of fact which should be corrected.

1. 'Italic' by universal consent and usage does not mean merely Osco-Umbrian; it includes also Faliscan and the Latinian dialects, together with Latin itself. Therefore 'prae-Italic' is justified in the sense defined in vol. i, p. v, and in vol. ii, p. 208 n. 1; and 'East Italic' in the sense defined in vol. ii, p. 226.

2. Kretschmer does *not* consider Raetic a dialect of Etruscan. In his paper in *Symbolae Philologicae* (to which reference was made in vol. ii, p. 632) he considers it a mixed dialect, partly of the Rasenna (whom he distinguishes very carefully from the Etruscans), partly Indo-European (more precisely Umbrian): *op. cit.*, p. 141 'diese Mischsprache mit ihrem Nebeneinander von rasennischen und umbrischen Flexionsformen.' This is very like my view, except that I consider the Indo-European elements of Raetic to be Illyrian rather than Umbrian; its Etruscan elements I freely admit, vol. ii, pp. x, 5, 57, 548 f. Your reviewer's assertion misrepresents both Kretschmer and me.

3. The interpretation of the 'prae-Italic' dialects is an undertaking which your reviewer regards as hopeless. He is entitled to his opinion. But it should be stated as an opinion, not as a fact. A 'competent observer' has expressed the contrary opinion, and he bases his opinion on the fact that in *The Prae-Italic Dialects* is gathered the necessary evidence, archaeological as well as philological, which your reviewer affects to despise: 'Espérons . . . que le grand et bel ouvrage de M. M. Conway et Whatmough aura le succès qu'il mérite, qu'il

attirera les travailleurs sur ce champ immense et presque inconnu . . . et que l'interprétation des documents fera désormais des progrès en rapport avec la parfaite et exacte présentation qu'ils en ont donnée' (A. Cuny, in *Revue des Etudes anciennes*, xxxvi, 1934, p. 425).

4. Anyone who holds that it will always be impossible to interpret the inscriptions, as some used to hold that Oscan and Umbrian would always be unintelligible, must, if only in order to be consistent, reject aid from any source. But the proper names of the dialect-areas have in fact proved valuable in the attempt to interpret the texts: for example, Ven. *uho.u.xon.tah* and *Fougonia* at Este. And a collection of names which is incomplete is of little use. The names are *not* repeated in vol. iii, which gives an index to them, unless an index is always 'repetition.'

5. Conway is no longer alive to defend his (and Pauli's) interpretation (and transliteration) of the form *rehtia*. But many 'competent observers,' Kretschmer among them, accept it, because a 'frequently repeated formula makes it possible' and even probable. Everything that goes with it in the texts tends to strengthen that interpretation. It is in fact necessary to assume the validity of the comparison of Ven. *rehtia* with Latin *rectus*, for the same kind of reason that it is necessary to assume, for the time being, the validity of the comparison of Gaulish *luxtos* with Irish *lucht*—an assumption made in the course of 'long and confused notes' by one J. Fraser in *Revue Celtique* xlii, 1925, pp. 95 f. As for the transliteration *rētia*, 'a theory need not be taken seriously simply because it has appeared in print.'

Yours faithfully,

J. WHATMOUGH.

Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass.

## SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

### CLASSICAL WEEKLY.

VOL. XXVIII, NOS. 6-10. NOVEMBER-DECEMBER, 1934.

D. O. S. Lowell (with notes by C. Knapp), *Vergilianism*. Views of Vergil's life and early

writings have changed radically in a generation: L. analyses poems of the Appendix Vergiliana and discusses recent opinions. J. Stinchcomb, *Catiline on the Stage*. Compares the presentations by Jonson, Crébillon, Voltaire, Dumas, and Ibsen. M. E. Hutchinson,



*The Difficulty of Latin Words, Forms, and Constructions of Varying Degrees of Frequency in High School Latin.* B. W. Bradley, *The Classics and the Masses.* W. F. J. Knight, *An Illustration of Vergil, Aen. II* 692-8. V. remembers Hom. *Od.* XII. 415-7 but had also seen some such fireball himself. E. T. Salmon, *Concerning Hic and Ille.* Hic as 'the former' is not uncommon. S. L. Mohler, *Pennsylvania Wolves.* Powers ascribed to the wolf's eyes and teeth; cp. Plin. *N.H.* XXVIII 228 and 257. C. A. Manning, *Finis Reipublicae.* Praises a tetralogy (so named) by the Yugoslav poet Pavicic. *Classical Articles in Non-Classical Periodicals* V-VI.

REVIEWS.—D. Bush, *Mythology and the Renaissance Tradition in English Poetry*, Minneapolis, 1932. Favourable (J. P. Pritchard). G. Thomson, *Aeschylus, Prometheus Bound*, Cambridge, 1932. Shows long and appreciative study (LaRue van Hook). Rhys Carpenter, *The Humanistic Value of Archaeology*, Martin Classical Lectures, vol. IV., Harvard, 1933. J. Day (two articles) rejects C's views that there was no contact between Greeks and Phoenicians before 750 B.C. and that the Greeks adopted the Phoenician alphabet about 700. There were two periods of contact, in 1430-1200, when Mycenaean traders traded to Phoenicia, and soon after 800, when Phoenicians sailed into the Aegean. The alphabet was adopted in the latter part of the 9th century B.C., perhaps via Rhodes. Tables are given of the letter-forms of Semitic and early Greek inscriptions.

## GNOMON.

X. 10. OCTOBER, 1934.

A. E. Taylor: *A commentary on Plato's Timaeus* [C.R. XLIII. 18] (Stenzel). Reviewed at length; T. deserves the thanks of all students of the *Timaeus*. L. J. Elferink: *Lekythos* [C.R. XLVIII. 237] (v. Blumenthal). Faulty method spoils what might have been a good book. B. E. Richardson: *Old Age among the Ancient Greeks* [C.R. XLVIII. 87] (Schmid). A misleading title to a book which for the most part wastes the time of author and reader alike. *Lycurge contre Léocrate, fragments.* Ed. F. Durrbach [C.R. XLVI. 215] (Pezopulos). Text and critical notes not satisfactory. P. contributes suggestions. A. Marbach: *Wortbildung, Wortwahl und Wortbedeutung als Mittel der Charakterzeichnung bei Petron* [Diss. Giessen, 1931. Pp. xii+183] (Haffter). M.'s main thesis is not proved; he would have done better to treat less material more completely. *Rutilius Claudius Namatianus de redivo suo* (1) ed. R. Helm [C.R. XLVII. 196], (2) ed. J. Vessereau and F. Préchac [C.R. XLVIII. 27] (Hosius). Helm supplies his readers with evidence, but rarely pronounces judgments; the French edition seeks to explain, and will endear the author to his countrymen. *England und die Antike* [C.R. XLVIII. 83] (Dannenberg). A collection of papers illustrating various aspects of the problem. *Usener und Wilamowitz. Ein*

*Briefwechsel, 1870-1905* [Leipzig-Berlin: Teubner, 1934. Pp. 70] (Harder). O. Grossmann: *Das Reiterbild in Malerei und Plastik* [Berlin: Würfelverlag, 1931. Pp. 138, 31 plates 4°] (Bulle). Badly constructed and written, though something may be learnt from it. G. E. Rizzo: *La Base di Augusto* [Naples, 1933. Pp. 108, 9 plates 4°] (Sieveking). S. disagrees with some of R.'s conclusions, but welcomes the issue of his article as a separate publication. E. Junyent: *Il Titolo di San Clemente in Roma* [Rome, 1932. Pp. 230, 75 illustrations] (Koethe). J.'s work is sometimes faulty, but increases our knowledge of late Roman building. O. A. Magnus: *Bibliografičeskij ukazatel' literatury po archaeologii, vyšedšej v SSSR za 1918-1928 gg.* [Leningrad, 1931. Pp. 116] (Diehl). A welcome proof of the activity of Russian archaeologists. F. Rüschke: *Das Seelenpneuma* [Paderborn: Schöningh, 1933. Pp. 84] (Leisegang). A survey of ancient teaching about the soul. W. Kroll: *Die Kultur der Ciceronischen Zeit 2* [C.R. XLVIII. 134] (Strasburger). The second volume is as valuable as the first.—Bibliographical Supplement 1934 Nr. 5 (down to September 30).

X. 11. NOVEMBER, 1934.

(1) L. D. Caskey: *Attic Vase Paintings in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.* Part I [Oxford: Univ. Press, 1931. Pp. ix+57, 4 plates 4°, with supplementary volume of 30 plates 2°]; (2) J. D. Beazley: *Attic Black-figure* [C.R. XLIV. 40]; (3) Ch. Dugas: *Les Vases de l'Héraion* [Paris: de Boccard, 1928. Pp. vi+205, with supplement of 70 plates] (Rumpf). (1) An admirable catalogue. (2) Illuminating to the public and instructive for the specialist. (3) The text is good and the illustrations are handy. E. Langlotz: *Catalogue of Greek Vases in the Museum of the University of Würzburg* [Munich: Obernetter, 1932. 234 plates and an explanatory volume] (Watzinger). Deals well with one of the richest collections in German Universities. J. Fröber: *Die Komposition der archaischen und frühklassischen Melopenbilder* [Diss. Giessen, 1933. Pp. 62] (Bulle). F. can stimulate, but is not scholarly enough to convince. A. Schober: *Der Fries des Hekateions von Lagina* [Baden b. Wien: Rohrer. Pp. 116, 45 illustrations, 35 plates] (Horn). Sch.'s book fills a notable gap. G. Brussin: *Gli scavi di Aquileia* [Udine, 1934. Pp. 253, 6 plates, 147 illustrations] (Egger). Br.'s useful book well illustrates the width of his knowledge and interests. *Monumenta Asiae Minoris antiqua.* Vol. 2: *Merianlik und Korykos* by E. Herzfeld and S. Guyer [Manchester: Univ. Press, 1930. Pp. xviii+207]; Vol. 3: *Denkmäler aus dem Rauhen Kilikien*, edited by J. Keil and A. Wilhelm [ibid., 1931. Pp. xiv+238, 58 plates] (Schede). Volumes which deserve thanks, though the methods of vol. 2 leave something to be desired. P. Wessner: *Scholien in Luvenalem vetustiora* [C.R. XLVI. 91] (Knoche). A masterly work of scholarship. A. Krokiewicz: *Nauka Epikura* [Cracow: Polish Academy of Science, 1929. Pp. iv+408] (Merlan). Diffi-

cult to assess. It is easier to find fault with K.'s theories than to propose better. J. E. Harry: *Greek Tragedy*, vol. 1 [C.R. XLVIII. 128] (Pohlenz). H. shows independence of feeling and judgment, but his emendations are very rarely acceptable. E. Tièche: *Thespis* [C.R. XLVIII. 36] (Nestle). T. bases his theories on questionable sources and does not in general advance our knowledge. G. Rosenberger: *Griechische Privatbriefe* [C.R. XLVIII. 241] (Schubart). Careful work. Sch. is ready to forgive occasional attempts to restore what is beyond restoration. B. V. Head: *A Guide to the Principal Coins*. . . [C.R. XLVII. 203] (Heichelheim). Useful and stimulating. J. F. d'Alton: *Roman Literary Theory and Criticism* [C.R. XLVI. 130] (Kroll). K. makes many objections, but does not condemn the book. Sven Blomgren: *Studia Fortunatiana* [C.R. XLVIII. 42] (Helm). A good example of criticism. W. Süss: *Studien zur lateinischen Bibel* [C.R. XLVII. 248] (Schrijnen). Interesting work on a difficult subject. J. Svennung: *Wortstudien zu den spätlateinischen Oribasiusrezensionen* [C.R. XLVIII. 155] (Hoppe). Some obvious mistakes, but useful work. J. Schümmer: *Die altchristliche Festenpraxis* [Münster: Aschendorff, 1933. Pp. x+259]. (Strathmann) *Aus dem Schatze des Altertums* [Bamberg: Buchner] (Sieveking). A series of selections from Greek, Latin, and early Christian authors; warmly welcomed.

X. 12. DECEMBER, 1934.

*Der Obergermanisch-rätische Limes der Römerreiches*. Lief. 50, Strecke 15: *Der rätische Limes von Kipfenberg bis zur Donau*, by J. Fink, F. Winkelman and E. Fabricius [Berlin-Leipzig: Petters, 1933. Pp. 75. 4<sup>e</sup>] (Gelzer). The appearance of this fascicule encourages the belief that the book started in 1894 will eventually be completed. (1) Fr. Hellmann: *Herodots Kroisos-Logos* [C.R.

XLVIII. 129], (2) H. Bischhoff: *Der Warner bei Herodot* [Diss. Marburg, 1932. Pp. v+83] (Sieveking). (1) H. builds too much on one aspect of Herodotus. (2) B.'s book contains some acute observations, but his main thesis is untenable. H. Drexler: *Die Komposition von Terenz' Adelphen und Plautus' Rudens* [C.R. XLVIII. 186] (Rieth). R. criticises at length. D. raises interesting problems, but his results are unacceptable. E. Hermann: *Lautgesetz und Analogie* [C.R. XLVIII. 82] (Fraenkel). H. combines real knowledge of individual languages with an interest in universal questions. E. Kieckers: *Historische lateinische Grammatik*, 2 parts [Munich: Hueber, 1930-1. Pp. xxiv+167, vii+334] (Burger). Full of solid learning, but rather weak on the historical side. L. M. Wilson: *Ancient Textiles from Egypt in the University of Michigan Collection* [Ann Arbor: Univ. of Mich. Press, 1933. Pp. 76, 23 plates 4<sup>e</sup>] (Wace). On the whole a good account of discoveries important because they offer the first scientific evidence for dating. H. Drerup: *Die Datierung der Mumienporträte* [Paderborn: Schöningh, 1933. Pp. 66] (Neugebauer). An engaging and talented book, though the argument might have been more developed. A. Mau: *Katalog der Bibliothek des Deutschen Archäol. Institutes in Rom*. New edition, 2 parts [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1932] (Müller). M. can find nothing to criticize. A. W. van Buren: *A bibliographical guide to Latium and Southern Etruria* (ed. 3.) [C.R. XLVIII. 40] (Crous). Cr. notes some faults and omissions which might be made good in a fourth edition of this excellent guide. J. W. Headlam: *Election by Lot at Athens*, ed. 2 [C.R. XLVII. 64] (Ehrenberg). A good book, but it should have been more thoroughly revised. K. Hillkowitz: *Zur Kosmographie des Aethicus* [Diss. Bonn. Pp. iv+73] (Kroll). It is to be hoped that H. will proceed to a critical edition of the work.—Bibliographical Supplement 1934 Nr. 6 (down to November 30).

## BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on classical studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

\*.\* Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.

Andrew (S. O.) Hector's Ransoming. A translation of Iliad XXIV. Pp. 34. Oxford: Shakespeare Head Press. Paper, 2s. 6d.

Berthelot (A.) Festus Avienus. Ora Maritima. Edition annotée, précédée d'une Introduction et accompagnée d'un Commentaire. Pp. 159; 6 maps. Paris: Champion, 1934. Paper, 10 fr.

Casey (R. P.) The Excerpta ex Theodoto of Clement of Alexandria. Edited with translation, introduction, and notes. Pp. 164. (Studies and Documents, edited by K. and S. Lake.) London: Christophers, 1934. Paper.

Constans (L.-A.) Cicéron. Correspondance.

Tome I. Texte établi et traduit. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1934. Paper, 30 fr.

Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum. United States of America. Providence: Museum of the Rhode Island School of Design. Fascicule I. By S. B. Luce. Pp. 49; 31 plates. Cambridge, U.S.A.: Harvard University Press (London: Milford). Cloth and boards, 20s. net.

Curschmann (D.) Griechische Verwaltungs-urkunden. Pp. 263-350; 4 plates. (Papyri landanae, fasc. VII.) Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1934. Paper, RM. 8.60.

- de Corte* (M.) Le Commentaire de Jean Philopon sur le Troisième Livre du "Traité de l'Âme" d'Aristote. Pp. xix + 86. (Bibl. de la Fac. de Philos. et Lettres de l'Univ. de Liège—Fasc. LXV.) Liège: Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres (Paris: Droz), 1934. Paper, 20 fr.
- Études de Papyrologie*. II ii. Pp. 73-251. Cairo: Société Royale Égyptienne de Papyrologie, 1934. Paper, P.T. 30.
- Falter* (O.) Der Dichter und sein Gott bei den Griechen und Römern. Pp. v + 95. Würzburg: Triltsch. Paper, RM. 3.
- Ferguson* (A. C.) The Manuscripts of Propertius. Pp. 68. Distributed by the University of Chicago Libraries, Chicago, Illinois. 1934. Paper.
- Friedländer* (P.) Die Melodie zu Pindars erstem pythischen Gedicht. Pp. 54. (Berichte über die Verh. d. Sächs. Akad. d. Wiss. zu Leipzig, Phil.-hist. Kl. 86. Band. 1934. 4. Heft.) Leipzig: Hirzel, 1934. Paper, RM. 2.
- Hanell* (K.) Megarische Studien. Pp. 227. Lund: Lindstedt, 1934. Paper.
- Hude* (C.) Xenophontis Commentarii. Editio maior. Pp. vi + 195. (Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teubn.) Leipzig: Teubner, 1934. Paper, RM. 3.80 (bound, 4.80).
- Kiefer* (O.) Sexual Life in Ancient Rome. Pp. ix + 379; 16 plates. London: Routledge, 1934. Cloth, 25s.
- Kuhn* (H.) Sokrates. Ein Versuch über den Ursprung der Metaphysik. Pp. 161. Berlin: 'Die Runde', 1934.
- Labowsky* (L.) Die Ethik des Panaitios. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des decorum bei Cicero und Horaz. Pp. 124. Leipzig: Meiner, 1934. Paper, RM. 8.
- Leider* (E.) Der Handel von Alexandria. Pp. 83. (Printed by Niemann and Moschinski of Hamburg.)
- Lengle* (J.) Römisches Strafrecht bei Cicero und den Historikern. Pp. 84. (Neue Wege zur Antike, 1. Reihe, Heft 11.) Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1934. Paper, RM. 4.
- Liddell and Scott*. A Greek-English Lexicon. A new edition. Part 8: περιφραγή-συνδισμός. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1934. Paper, 10s. 6d. net.
- Morris* (Sir W.) The Iliad of Homer translated. Pp. 566. London etc.: Oxford University Press. Cloth, 6s.
- Marsh* (F. B.) A History of the Roman World from 146 to 30 B.C. Pp. xii + 427; 5 maps. (Methuen's History of the Greek and Roman World.) London: Methuen, 1935. Cloth, 15s.
- Milne* (H. J. M.) Greek Shorthand Manuals. Syllabary and Commentary. Pp. 78; 9 plates. London: Egypt Exploration Society, Quaritch, Milford, Cambridge University Press, and Kegan Paul, 1934. Cloth and boards.
- Momigliano* (A.) Filippo il Macedone. Saggio sulla storia greca del IV secolo a. C. Pp. xvi + 211. Florence: le Monnier, 1934. Paper, L. 30.
- Mondolfo* (B.) L'infinito nel pensiero dei Greci. Pp. 439. Florence: le Monnier, 1934. Paper, L. 40.
- Morin* (G.) I. Firmici Materni Consultationes Zacchaei et Apollonii ad normam codicum recognitas adiectis adnotationibus criticis et indicibus edidit G. M. Pp. 134. (Florilegium Patristicum, Fasc. XXXIX.) Bonn: Hanstein, 1934. Paper, M. 5.80.
- Mountford* (J. F.) The Scholia Bembina edited with annotations. Pp. vii + 131. London: Hodder and Stoughton (University Press of Liverpool), 1934. Cloth and boards, 10s. 6d.
- Niccolini* (G.) I fasti dei tribuni della plebe. Pp. xv + 589. Milan: Giuffrè, 1934. Paper, L. 75.
- Opuscula Archaeologica*. Vol. I, fasc. 1. (Skifter utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Rom. IV: 1.) Pp. 85; 8 plates, and illustrations in text. Lund: Gleerup (London: Milford), 1934. Paper, 10s. 6d.
- Page* (D. L.) Actors' Interpolations in Greek Tragedy, studied with special reference to Euripides' *Iphigeneia in Aulis*. Pp. xi + 228. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1934. Cloth, 10s.
- Schröder* (H. O.) Galeni in Platonis Timaeum commentarii fragmenta collegit disposuit explicavit H. O. S. Pp. xxviii + 112. (Corpus Medicorum Graecorum; Supplementum I.) Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1934. Paper, RM. 8.80.
- Skutella* (M.) S. Aureli Augustini Confessionum libri XIII. Post P. Knoell iteratis curis edidit M. S. Pp. xxxii + 381. (Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teubn.) Leipzig: Teubner, 1934. Cloth, RM. 6.80 (paper, 5.40).
- Tersaghi* (N.) Lucilio. Pp. vii + 449. Turin: 'L'Erma', 1934. Paper, L. 30.
- The Cambridge Ancient History*. Vol. X: The Augustan Empire, 44 B.C.—A.D. 70. Pp. xxxii + 1058; maps, tables, plans, etc. Volume of plates IV, prepared by C. T. Seltman. Pp. xiv + 210. Cambridge: University Press, 1934. Cloth, 37s. 6d. and 12s. 6d.
- The Year's Work in Classical Studies*, 1934. Edited by S. G. Owen. Pp. xi + 94. Bristol: Arrowsmith, 1934. Paper, 3s. 6d. net.
- von Scheliha* (R.) Dion. Die platonische Staatsgründung in Sizilien. Pp. viii + 166; frontispiece and map. (Das Erbe der Alten, 2. Reihe XXV.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1934. Paper, M. 5.50 (bound, 6.50).
- Wagner* (J.) Carmina Horatii selecta in usum iuventutis studiosae ad modos aptata. Modos partim collegit partim composuit J. W. Pp. 43. [Parthenon (Societas Amicorum Litterarum Humanarum Hungarica): Acta Societatis, Fasc. IX.] Budapest: Gottlieb, 1934. Paper.
- Wassink* (J. H.) Index verborum et locutionum quae Tertulliani de Anima libro continentur. Pp. iv + 264. Bonn: Hanstein, 1935. Paper, M. 10.80.
- Way* (A. S.) The Homeric Hymns with Hero and Leander in English Verse. Pp. 84. Hesiod translated. Pp. 68. Speeches in Thucydides and Funeral Orations translated. Pp. 224. Hymns of Callimachus with the Hymn of Kleantes in English Verse. Pp. 36. London: Macmillan, 1934. Cloth, 3s. 6d., 3s. 6d., 5s., 2s. 6d.

